Metaphors of Authorship: Eighteenth-Century Novelists' Imaginations of the Reading Publics, 1740–1810

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BY

Jen-chou Liu

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIERMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Tony C. Brown, Dissertation Adviser

August 2021

To Lillian and Violet

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

BN	Barbauld, Anna Letitia. *The British Novelists; with an Essay, and Prefaces Biographical and Critical*. London, 1810. 50 vols.
E	Burney, Frances. *Evelina; or the History of a Young Lady's Entrance into the World.* Edited by Edward A. Bloom and Vivien Jones, Oxford UP, 2008.
EJL	Burney, Frances. *The Early Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney*. Edited by Lars E. Troide et al., McGill-Queen's UP, 1988–2012. 5 vols.
JL	Burney, Frances. *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame D'Arblay).* Edited by Joyce Hemlow, Clarendon, 1972–84. 12 vols.
P	Richardson, Samuel. *Pamela: Or, Virtue Rewarded.* Edited by Peter Sabor, Penguin, 2003.
P2	Richardson, Samuel. *Pamela in Her Exalted Condition.* Edited by Albert J. Rivero, Cambridge UP, 2012.
SL	Richardson, Samuel. *Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson.* Edited by John Carroll, Clarendon, 1964.
SPP	Barbauld, Anna Letitia. *Selected Poetry and Prose*. Broadview, 2002.
TS	Sterne, Laurence. *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*. Edited by Melvin and Joan New, UP of Florida, 1978. 2 vols. References are to volume, book, and page numbers.

Introduction

From its beginning to its end, the eighteenth century saw over 350 per cent increase in titles published annually in England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland (Suarez 22). The eighteenth-century Britain was, Samuel Johnson observes in *The Adventurer* no. 115, "The Age of Authors; for, perhaps, there never was a time in which men of all degrees of ability, of every kind of education, of every profession and employment, were posting with ardour so general to the press" (457). Johnson's feeling of shock was not unique among eighteenth-century authors. In *The Work of Writing*, Clifford Siskin describes a "mix of promise and threat, anticipation and dread, resound in the writings of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in Britain" and argues that "writers throughout the eighteenth century were so astonished by the sheer volume of writing they began to encounter that they wrote about it" (2). The Age of Authors not only ushered great quantities of works into the literary marketplace but also provided the conditions for the emergence of the modern author. In "What Is an Author?" (1969), Michel Foucault coins the "author-function" and points to the eighteenth century as its origin: "it was at the moment when a system of ownership and strict copyright rules were established (toward the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century) that the transgressive properties always intrinsic to the act of writing became the forceful imperative of literature" (124–25). Foucault's essay, along with Roland Barthes's "The Death of the Author," have influenced, to a greater or lesser extent, almost every ensuing discussion of authorship, and "they have largely set the terms of the debate and have in equal measure been applauded for their radical reinterpretation of authorship and

criticized for their alleged incoherence, inaccuracies and anachronisms" (Bennett 5).[1] As Andrew Bennett summarizes, Foucault initiated "what we might call the 'praxis' or 'pragmatics' of authorship: the social, historical, institutional and discursive limits on, and conventions of, the author" (5).

In the studies of eighteenth-century novels, Foucault's author-function helped shape the direction of scholarship through his emphasis on this historical period. Roger Chartier credits Foucault's essay for influencing Martha Woodmansee's and Mark Rose's works on copyright: "By moving the figure of the author back in time and by articulating it with mechanisms for controlling the circulation of texts or for lending them authority, Foucault's essay invites us to a retrospective investigation that gives the history of the conditions of the production, dissemination, and appropriation of texts particular pertinence" (32).[2] Since Woodmansee and Rose, the history of the book has been one of the main approaches to studying eighteenth-century literature. As Dustin Griffin describes, scholarship on print culture and the literary marketplace over the past two decades has "led on the one hand to studies of the relationship between major writers and their booksellers and even their printers, and more recently to studies of the interactive relationship between writers and readers" (10).

[1] For Barthes's and Foucault's views on authorship and the modern subject, see Seán Burke, *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault, and Derrida* (Edinburgh UP, 2010).
[2] Chartier refers to Martha Woodmansee, "The Genius and the Copyright: Economic and Legal Conditions of the Emergence of the 'Author,'" *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 17, no. 4 (1984): 425–48; and Mark Rose, "The Author as Proprietor: *Donaldson v. Becket* and the Genealogy of Modern Authorship," *Representations* 23, no. 1 (1988): 51–85.

As authorship has been increasingly studied through the interrelations between different actors in the eighteenth-century literary marketplace, the author returns to the foreground of scholarship, albeit under new conditions. As Chartier observes, the author

> is both dependent and constrained. He is dependent in that he is not the unique master of the meaning of his text, and his intentions, which provided the impulse to produce the text, are not necessarily imposed either on those who turn his text into a book (bookseller-publishers or print workers) or on those who appropriate it by reading it. He is constrained in that he undergoes the multiple determinations that organize the social space of literary production and that, in a more general sense, determine the categories and the experiences that are the very matrices of writing. (28–29)

This new approach brought about a social turn in eighteenth-century studies. Challenging the assumption that the eighteenth century tells the story of print culture's triumph over scribal culture in *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (1999), Margaret J. M. Ezell contends that "manuscript culture permitted and encouraged participation in literary life of groups of people whom print technology effectively isolated and alienated" (12).[3] In *Literary Coteries and the Making of Modern Print Culture: 1740–1790* (2016), Betty A. Schellenberg argues that script and print offered "a rich array of options for literary expression, exchange, and preservation" (2). Hilary Havens coins the term "networked authorship" in *Revising the Eighteenth-Century Novel: Authorship from Manuscript to Print* (2019) to describe how novelists revised their works according to the feedback of

[3] For an overview of the manuscript culture in the early modern period, see Margaret J. M. Ezell, "Manuscript and Print Cultures 1500–1700," in *The Cambridge Handbook of Literary Authorship*, ed. Ingo Berensmeyer, Gert Buelens, and Marysa Demoor (Cambridge UP, 2019), 115–32.

public and private readers. While the studies of social conditions have expanded our understanding of authorship, their descriptive approach flattens the networks in print and scribal cultures and treats every actor from author to bookseller to critic to reader with nearly equal importance. We now know much about how and why authors made certain decisions in the literary marketplace, yet perhaps not as much about how they conceptualized their authorship. Uncovering how novelists theorized their authorial identities would help us develop a more holistic understanding of their authorship and appreciate the heterogeneous ways in which they perceived and engaged with the literary marketplace.[4]

Though few novelists theorized their authorship as poets did in Alexander Pope's *An Essay on Criticism*, Edward Young's *Conjectures on Original Composition*, or William Wordsworth's preface to *Lyrical Ballads*, we can study how eighteenth-century novelists defined their authorship through metaphors.[5] In *Tom Jones*, for example, Henry Fielding compares his authorial identity to the host of an eating house in the consumer society: "AN author ought to consider himself, not as a gentleman who gives a private or eleemosynary treat, but rather as one who keeps a public ordinary, at which all persons are welcome for their money" (29). Fielding further defines authorship through the relationship between the ancients and the moderns: "The ancients may be considered as a

[4] Studying novelists' conceptualizations of authorship is a way of ascertaining their intentions, not in the sense of what they meant by their works as opposed by New Critics, but in the sense of the function and meaning of their authorship. For the distinction between intention and motive, see Mark Vareschi, "Motive, Intention, Anonymity, and *Evelina*," *ELH* 82, no. 4 (2015): 1136.

[5] For how Young's *Conjectures on Original Composition* influenced the discussion and development of authorship and copyright in eighteenth-century Germany, see Martha Woodmansee, "The Genius and the Copyright: Economic and Legal Conditions of the Emergence of the 'Author,'" *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 17, no. 4 (1984): 425–48.

rich common, where every person who hath the smallest tenement in Parnassus hath a free right to fatten his muse" (540). However, Fielding's explicit use of authorial metaphors may be the exception rather than the rule. In *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright*, Mark Rose argues that two metaphors—paternity and real estate—helped shape authorship and copyright in the eighteenth century:

> How could one think about an author's relationship to his writings? The most familiar metaphor was paternity, but to invoke the representation of a text as a child in order to bolster the author's right to sell his works in the marketplace presented rhetorical difficulties. An alternative metaphor, literary property as a landed estate, had long been available in the rhetoric of the stationers' pleas and claims. . . . During the course of the next fifty years, the figuration of the literary work as a form of estate would be reiterated and elaborated, and it contributed to a new way of thinking about literature. (41)

Of the examples of said metaphors, only one (Cervantes's *Don Quixote*) is from a novel. When he revisits the paternity and real estate metaphors in "Copyright and Its Metaphors," Rose alludes to Fielding's *Tom Jones* as one of the prime examples of the real estate metaphor, but no specific passage is discussed (8). In *Nobody's Story: The Vanishing Acts of Women Writers in the Marketplace, 1670–1820*, Catherine Gallagher discusses Aphra Behn's prostitute and monarch metaphors and Maria Edgeworth's manufacturing and coining metaphors to analyze their authorial personae as embodiments of "nobody." Clearly, metaphors play an important role in studying novelists' authorial identities, but metaphors are absent in Gallagher's discussions of Delarivier Manley, Charlotte Lennox, and Frances Burney, possibly because no explicit metaphors could be found in these three women novelists' works.

Novelists certainly contemplated on their authorial identities in relation to the scribal and print cultures, but they may not have expressed their authorship through explicit metaphors because they had not formed coherent theories while they were still in the process of defining the genre of the novel. Though not all novelists conceptualize their models of authorship in concrete metaphors, they could use haphazard expressions to characterize various aspects of authorship in their writings. These scattered expressions provide pathways to decipher the novelists' authorial identities—however silenced, unformed, or unconscious—because they can be interpreted as the metaphorical linguistic expressions in conceptual metaphor theory. In *Metaphors We Live By*, cognitive linguists George Lakoff and Mark Johnson theorize how human thought processes are metaphorical: "Since metaphorical expressions in our language are tied to metaphorical concepts in a systematic way, we can use metaphorical linguistic expressions to study the nature of metaphorical concepts and to gain an understanding of the metaphorical nature of our activities" (7). In their example of the conceptual metaphor "argument is war," they demonstrate how it manifests in everyday expressions where arguments can be indefensible, demolished, and won (Lakoff and Johnson 4). Zoltán Kövecses explains that "the linguistic expressions (i.e., ways of talking) make explicit, or are manifestations of, the conceptual metaphors (i.e., ways of thinking)" (7). By examining the ways in which eighteenth-century novelists talked about their authorship, I can fathom how they thought about their authorship and then assemble conceptual metaphors of authorship in the form of "_____ is A/B/C," where the blank can be filled in with different aspects of authorship (e.g. "writing in general," "novel writing in particular," "publishing," etc.). Once the conceptual metaphors of authorship are assembled, I will examine the

correspondences, or mappings, between the source domains (i.e. A/B/C) and the target domain (i.e. authorship), the former providing the knowledge through which we understand the latter.

The correspondences between the source and target domains of authorial metaphors may not be numerous, but they will form the foundation for understanding how novelists conceptualize their authorship. Once the source domains are identified, I will investigate the metaphors' entailments, which occur "[w]hen rich additional knowledge about a source is mapped onto a target" (Kövecses 122). For instance, the metaphor AN ARGUMENT IS A JOURNEY can be expressed as "We have *covered a lot of ground*," with an emphasis on the "progress and content" of argument (Kövecses 92). While the metaphor focuses on how an argument, like a journey, proceeds along a path, "we also have some additional knowledge about journeys, namely, that we can stray from the path. . . . This manifests itself in the metaphorical entailment that we can also 'digress from' the line of an argument. In this case, we use an additional piece of knowledge about journeys to make sense of a possible feature of arguments" (Kövecses 122). Every source domain has a reservoir of what Kövecses calls "metaphorical entailment potential," which a metaphor may exploited fully or partially in its conventional expressions (123). I will survey the source domains invoked in authorial metaphors, and I will especially attend to the entailments not explicitly exploited in the metaphors as a thought experiment to see what new insights they might yield. This approach may seem unorthodox, for to know a metaphor, Kövecses explains,

> means to know the systematic mappings between a source and a target. It is not suggested that this happens in a conscious manner. This knowledge is largely unconscious, and it is only for the purposes of analysis that we bring the mappings into awareness. However, when we know a conceptual metaphor, we use the linguistic expressions that reflect it in such a way that we do not violate the mappings that are conventionally fixed for the linguistic community. In other words, not any element of b can be mapped onto any element of a. The linguistic expressions used metaphorically must conform to established mappings, or correspondences, between the source and the target. (11)

However, established or conventional mappings do not limit metaphors in literature. One of the features of poetic metaphor, according to Lakoff and Mark Turner, is "[t]he novel extension of the metaphor to include elements otherwise not mapped, such as extending DEATH IS SLEEP to dreaming" (71). To the entailments explicitly used by novelists in their metaphors, I will add potential entailments to create assemblages that expand the original metaphors into more complete versions of themselves.

To assemble authorial metaphors, I will start with the paternity and real estate metaphors and treat them as conceptual metaphors. As Rose argues, the paternity and real estate metaphors form the "unconscious of copyright law" and still condition how we think about authorship in the twenty-first century ("Copyright" 8). As he explains,

> The paternity metaphor underwrites the system as a whole, while the real estate metaphor objectifies and reifies the author's production and allows it to be treated as a commodity. Each trope in its own way contributes to the tendency to think of copyrights as permanent and absolute property rights. The paternity metaphor does this by invoking the godlike notion of creation out of nothingness. The real

> estate metaphor does this by analogizing copyright to land which, of course, persists forever. ("Copyright" 9)

Though the history of both metaphors could be traced back to the antiquity, they underwent dramatic changes in the eighteenth century because the development of the literary marketplace and the copyright law "called for a remetaphorization of the author's relationship to his work" ("Copyright" 6). Rose does not specify whom were call to the task, nor does he discuss remetaphorization further. I agree with Rose's evaluation of the paternity and real estate metaphors, but I think we should investigate not the remetaphorization but the reinterpretations and revisions of the two metaphors.

To set up a framework wherein I can examine the variations of the paternity and real estate metaphors, I will first redefine them as conceptual metaphors. Rose's definitions are, paradoxically, both too specific and not precise enough. They are too specific because they are confined to one of many possible situations. At its core, the paternity metaphor describes the relationship between a parent and a child. Though historically the metaphor has been deployed in the patriarchal context, we should not preclude the scenario where an author "mothers" her work. On the other hand, the real estate metaphor is imprecise because Rose ignores the historical and material conditions on which authors construct the metaphor. He cites Plato's comparing writing to plowing as the earliest example of the real estate metaphor, but ancient Greeks' agrarian system was very different from eighteenth-century Britain's and from the Lockean property theory that London's booksellers relied on to defend perpetual copyright. In the case of Fielding's common land metaphor discussed above, it is based on the open field system belonging to the feudal England before the enclosure movements and the rapid

developments of domestic and international trades in the seventeenth century. By defining the paternity metaphor too narrowly and the real estate metaphor too imprecisely, Rose precludes other iterations of the metaphors that could tell a more complete story of authorship in the eighteenth century.

Following the conventions of conceptual metaphor theory, I will call the paternity and real estate metaphors WRITING IS BIRTHING and WRITING IS CULTIVATION metaphors. The target domain, WRITING, may refer to any aspect of writing and publishing novels in the eighteenth century, depending on how the metaphors are used by the authors. The source domains—birthing and cultivation—contain rich knowledge and entailments, providing clues to deciphering authorship. In the following chapters, I will assemble the authorial metaphors of Samuel Richardson, Laurence Sterne, Frances Burney, and Anna Letitia Barbauld from the linguistic expressions scattered among their published and unpublished writings. I treat the assembled metaphors as elaborations, which Lakoff and Turner define as "[t]he imaginative filling in of special cases, such as having the vehicle in DEATH IS DEPARTURE be a coach" (71). By examining how the elaborations reinterpret, revise, or reinvent WRITING IS BIRTHING and WRITING IS CULTIVATION metaphors, I explore the potential insights afforded by the respective source domains the authors choose. My method of tracing the variations on the two conceptual metaphors of authorship is similar to Sean Silver's approach in *The Mind Is a Collection: Case Studies in Eighteenth-Century Thought*:

> the central strand of Enlightenment epistemology—a strand persisting in the modern era—leans against a certain guiding metaphor. In its most general form, the metaphor is this: the mind is a collection. This figure takes different forms,

> ranging from literary ornaments and the etymologies of concepts to elaborately intended material models and theories of brainwork. As a unifying trope, it also inhabits different shapes, different metaphorical sources or material models. . . . All of these models were differently in play—and voiced at least once—but the grand metaphor was never quite new. This figure, which runs like a subterranean river, percolates up in numerous treatises, manuals, and handbooks on the anatomy of the mind. (1)[6]

By mapping the various ways in which authorial metaphors roam within and beyond the conventional boundaries of WRITING IS BIRTHING and WRITING IS CULTIVATION, I aim to reveal how novelists and critics define novelistic authorship through the multifarious relationships between the literary marketplace and their personal identities.

In the first half of the dissertation, I will discuss Richardson's and Sterne's interpretations of WRITING IS CULTIVATION. At its most fundamental level, the CULTIVATION conceptual metaphor describes an author's relationship with his or her work in terms of an individual's relationship with land, a relationship that could manifest in the working (agriculture), inhabiting (occupation), and owning (proprietorship) of the land. Depending on the types of cultivation, an author's work could be imagined as either yields (e.g. crops) or real estate. Richardson and Sterne, informed by their different relationships with land as a landed bookseller (Richardson) and a pastor (Sterne), transpose WRITING IS CULTIVATION into the domains of garden and parish respectively. Chapter One discusses how Richardson's use of the grafting metaphor to

[6] He references Lakoff only once in a footnote about the relationship between philosophical and metaphor analyses. He references George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought* but not other conceptual metaphor theory.

represent unauthorized continuations of novels or scholarly editions of old English geniuses (e.g. Spenser, Shakespeare) is indicative of how he based his understanding of literary ownership on the garden, a plot of encircled domestic land that intruders or thieves could trespass. Incensed by numerous imitations, continuations, and parodies of *Pamela: Or, Virtue Rewarded* (1740), Richardson condemns them as "scandalous Attempts of Ingrafting upon his Plan" in a private letter (*SL* 43). Ironically, Richardson himself was compelled by these "engraftments" to produce his own graft, as he published the sequel, *Pamela in Her Exalted Condition* (1741), and compares Pamela's reading and writing to grafting. A decade later, Richardson criticizes scholarly editions of Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton as engraftments in a series of letters in the 1750s. Through the source domain of eighteenth-century horticulture, I assemble the grafting metaphor from Richardson's use of grafting and related gardening images in both parts of *Pamela* and in his letters. I argue that Richardson imagines his authorial identity as a gardener in the literary market: his pursuit of novel writing was driven by profit, and he imagines intellectual theft as sexual violation whose bastard byproducts cheat him out of his rightful profit.

In Chapter Two, I analyze how Sterne reinterprets CULTIVATION through the source domain of the parish in *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*. As one of the foundational themes of the novel, opinions provide insight into an individual's character and correct the "vile pruriency for fresh adventures" in eighteenth-century novels by urging the reader to read for knowledge (*TS* 1.20.66). Sterne gives us three metaphors to theorize opinions through religious, philosophical, and social routes. With the scribe metaphor, Sterne tests and rejects the inspirational model of opinion forming

because of the method's over-reliance on enthusiasm, a dangerous overflow of pathos/emotions without the check of judgment. With the picking-up metaphor, Sterne explores a Lockean explanation of opinions and exposes its implausibility due to the omission of authors in the discussion. The state of nature, as a spatial model for understanding, is inadequate to describe the textual world where people circulate opinions. Finally, Sterne uses the settlement metaphor to propose a parochial model of authorship informed by the socio-legal management of poor relief. By imagining communities where authors and readers can freely move, Sterne suggests that the association *with* ideas—forming familiar, friendly relationships with ideas made by other authors—both define the author-reader relationship and certifies one's membership as a professional author. Thus, Sterne treats CULTIVATION not as physically tilling the land but as improving the lives of the people living on the land (i.e. parish) through social welfare.

In the second part of the dissertation, I will examine how WRITING IS BIRTHING is questioned and revised by Burney and Barbauld amid the eighteenth-century gender politics. As women could not own real estate in the eighteenth century, BIRTHING would seem an obvious metaphor for their authorship because of their biological capability to give births. However, WRITING IS BIRTHING had long been monopolized by male authors who present it as the paternity metaphor. As Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar observe in *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*, "In patriarchal Western culture, therefore, the text's author is a father, a progenitor, a procreator, an aesthetic patriarch whose pen is an instrument of generative power like his penis. More, his pen's power, like his penis's

power, is not just the ability to generate life but the power to create a posterity to which he lays claim" (6). Ensnared in the tradition of the paternity metaphor, women authors suffered, Gilbert and Gubar argue, "anxiety of authorship": "a radical fear that she cannot create, that because she can never become a 'precursor' the act of writing will isolate or destroy her" (48–49).

Chapter Three studies Burney's anonymity and authorship around *Evelina, or the History of a Young Lady's Entrance to the World*. In her prefatory poem and preface, Burney expresses her deference and debt to her biological father and literary forefathers, situating her authorship in the patriarchal tradition. While critics have scrutinized the text and paratexts of the novel as well as Burney's private journals for possible models of her authorial identity, few have attended to how Burney wrote and published *Evelina* in stages from 1777 to 1779, and thus manufactured a coherent authorial identity. To reconstruct Burney's sequential revisions of her authorship, I examine Burney's deployment of "cipher" vis-à-vis Nobody. By relating cipher's meanings of monogram, code, and zero to Evelina's face, writing, and person, I argue that the cipher metaphor encapsulates Burney's three-year journey to publishing *Evelina*. By peeling off the meanings of "cipher" layered onto the text and paratexts of *Evelina*, we see how Burney uses the cipher metaphor to transpose the question of women's patriarchal affinities to a celebration of female authorship.

In Chapter Four, I turn to Barbauld's anthology *The British Novelists* to discuss how a female critic contends with the paternity metaphor in her project of canonizing the novel. The works of thirteen male authors and eight women authors are included in the anthology. While she writes prefaces for all but one of the authors, the prefaces to women

novelists are structured differently than those to male novelists. Instead of detailing an author's family, education, career, and marriage as she does for male novelists' lives, Barbauld downplays fathers and husbands in her prefaces to women novelists, whom she emphatically associates with the literary marketplace. By tracing how her representation of women novelists' separation from the world is founded on her conceptualization of dissenters' status in society, I show how Barbauld endows women novelists with a distinct authorial identity. However, the dissenter metaphor never fully takes shape because of her ambivalence to the patriarchy and her gender.

While assembling the grafting, settlement, cipher, and dissenter metaphors, I take some license to expand these metaphors to include entailments the authors may not have intended. However, my accounts of the metaphors are both coherent with the authors' views on their identities and informed by larger cultural, historical, intellectual contexts. By analyzing Richardson's, Sterne's, Burney's, and Barbauld's authorial metaphors as interpretations of WRITING IS BIRTHING and WRITING IS CULTIVATION metaphors, I find a middle way between cognitive linguists' and literary critics' approaches to metaphor. As Elena Semino and Gerard Steen describe, "[w]hile cognitive metaphor theory in particular relates conventional metaphorical patterns in a language to shared cultural and cognitive models, many studies of metaphor in literature relate distinctive, idiosyncratic metaphorical patterns in a writer's works, a single text, or parts of a text to an individual's particulars cognitive habits, concerns, goals, and worldview" (244). My approach traces how the four authors engage with WRITING IS BIRTHING and WRITING IS CULTIVATION metaphors and highlights their innovations accomplished through their selected source domains. In my account, BIRTHING and

CULTIVATION metaphors create the conditions of possibility for eighteenth-century novelists to conceptualize their authorship. Emphasizing the conditions of authorship, my study aims to follow Hans Blumenberg's metaphorology, which "seeks to burrow down to the substructure of thought, the underground, the nutrient solution of systematic crystallizations" (5). What he calls "absolute metaphors," those which preserve and reveal the nonconceptual histories of concepts, "give structure to a world, representing the nonexperienceable, nonapprehensible totality of the real. To the historically trained eye, they therefore indicate the fundamental certainties, conjectures, and judgments in relation to which the attitudes and expectations, actions and inactions, longings and disappointments, interests and indifferences, of an epoch are regulated" (14).[7] I treat "authorship" as one of the concepts studied in Blumenberg's metaphorology, but unlike his sweeping philosophical project that encompasses nearly the entire Western civilization, I focus on individual authors' use of metaphors to represent aspects of their authorial identities in their works. By attending to the source domains Richardson, Sterne, Burney, and Barbauld draw on to create their metaphors, I underscore the twofold historicity of authorial metaphors: not only their tenors (i.e. writing and publishing) but also their vehicles (i.e. grafting, settlement, cipher, and dissenter) in the context of the eighteenth century.

[7] For the function of metaphor in philosophy, see Jacques Derrida, "White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy," trans. F. C. T. Moore, *New Literary History* 6, no. 1 (1974): 5–74; Paul Ricœur, *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-Disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language* (U Toronto P, 1977); and Mark M. Johnson, "Philosophy's Debt to Metaphor," in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs, (Cambridge UP, 2008), 39–52.

"Lewd and Ungenerous Engraftment": Pamela's and Samuel Richardson's Authorships

Samuel Richardson published the first and second volumes of *Pamela* in November 1740. The domestic and international success of the novel inspired numerous imitations, continuations, and parodies. Richardson himself counts "no less than 16 Pieces, as Remarks, Imitations, Retailings of the Story, Pyracies, &c" (qtd. in Keymer and Sabor 2). In the face of a swarm of imitations that Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor call "a Grubstreet grabfest" (2), Richardson said surprisingly little about his imitators. He had no plans of writing a sequel to *Pamela* because "Second Parts are generally received with Prejudice, and it was treating the Public too much like a Bookseller to pursue a Success till they tired out the buyers" (August 1741, *SL* 44). However, his attitude changed when John Kelly published *Pamela's Conduct in High Life* (2 vols. May and September 1741), a work so incensed Richardson that he calls Kelly and his booksellers as "the High-Life men," a term often picked up by scholars to refer to all imitators of *Pamela*. In his letter to James Leake in August 1741, three months after Kelly's first volume of *Pamela's Conduct* was published, Richardson gives a detailed account of his dealings with "the spurious High-Life." He starts by reiterating his disinclination to writing a sequel of *Pamela*:

> it was true I had said so to several of my Friends who had pressed me on the success to continue it; but that was upon a Supposition, no one would offer to meddle with it; in which Case I had resolved to do it myself, rather than my Plan should be basely ravished out of my Hands, and, probably, my Characters

> depreciated and debased, by those who knew nothing of the Story, nor the Delicacy required in the Continuation of the Piece. (*SL* 43)

Then Richardson complains about "the Baseness as well as Hardship that a Writer could not be permitted to end his own Work, when and how he pleased, without such scandalous Attempts of Ingrafting upon his Plan" (*SL* 43–44). In December 1741, Richardson published his official sequel, *Pamela in Her Exalted Condition*.

Why did Kelly's continuation, which is neither the first nor the most famous of its kind, elicit such strong response from Richardson?[1] According to Keymer and Sabor, *Pamela's Conduct* was a real threat to Richardson because Richard Chandler, the bookseller who commissioned Kelly to write the continuation, implemented a series of savvy marketing strategies to endow Kelly's sequel with "an air of definitiveness as the natural companion" to Richardson's *Pamela* (Keymer and Sabor 55). One of the most successful strategies of Chandler's is the choice of title, which "was perfected judged, and it was the title that lodged in the public mind, not the starchy second-best wording with which Richardson was left" (Keymer and Sabor 55). Richardson was forced by *Pamela's Conduct* into a difficult situation where he had to fend off attacks from two fronts: "Not only did *Pamela's Conduct* require Richardson to reassert his right of property over *Pamela*'s world; it also required him to enter into interpretative battle over the novel's messages and meanings" (Keymer and Sabor 76). Richardson's comment on *Pamela's Conduct* marks the first instance of applying the grafting metaphor to

[1] By the time Kelly published his first volume in May 1741, two similar works—Henry Fielding's *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews* (April 1740) and the anonymous *Pamela Censured* (April 1741)—had already been published, and at least two more—Eliza Haywood's *Anti-Pamela* (June 1741) and James Parry's *The True Anti-Pamela* (June 1741)—were published prior to Richardson's letter to Leake.

condemning any continuation of *Pamela* as alien scions illegitimately inserted onto the stock. As Keymer and Sabor observe, Richardson's language of engraftment is curiously sexualized ("ravished") and monetized ("depreciated" and "debased"):

> There is a furious eloquence to his images of ravishment, debasement and engraftment, which swarm with lurid connotations: sexual despoliation; pecuniary corruption; monstrous, invasive propagation. As so often, one senses the novelist's deep inward identification with his embattled heroine, as the tale of virtue they share—and the material reward this tale should bring—is besieged and threatened from without. (57–58)

While Keymer and Sabor attend to the sexual and pecuniary connotations of the grafting metaphor, they do not explain how or why engraftment constitutes "monstrous, invasive propagation." Their inattention to engraftment misses an opportunity to explore how grafting is inherently sexualized and monetized in Richardson's view. Eight years after he first complained about the "scandalous Attempts of Ingrafting," Richardson used the same grafting metaphor to condemn Henry Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*: "The Pamela, which he abused in his Shamela, taught him how to write to please, tho' his manners are so different. Before his Joseph Andrews (hints and names taken from that story, with a lewd and ungenerous engraftment) the poor man wrote without being read" (To Lady Bradshaigh, 1749, *SL* 133). Richardson's patterned emphasis on the sexual and pecuniary aspects of grafting should be studied as the key to understanding his authorship.

To study the grafting metaphor, I will trace its development in Richardson's novels and letters, especially in *Pamela II*. When critics comment on the sequel, their verdicts are usually negative. T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel believe that "the

second part of Pamela shows Richardson at his worst—pompous, proper, proud of himself, and above all dull" (153). Terry Castle calls it "more than a disappointment. At times it seems almost to insult us, to affront our expectations, including our very desire for repetition. Even for a sequel, it is exceptionally frustrating. Part 2 seems both to tease and to thwart us" (*Masquerade and Civilization* 135). Granted, the second part of *Pamela* is lackluster when compared to the first part, but it should be studied more for what it reveals about Richardson's view on authorship than for its aesthetics. As Anna Letitia Barbauld points out, Richardson's sequel is "less a continuation than the author's defence of himself" ("Life of Samuel Richardson" 1:lxxvii). *Pamela II* merits our critical attention because Richardson explicitly associates Pamela with grafting when he compares the ideas she absorbs through writing to "some fine Fruit grafted upon a common Free-stock" (*P2* 40). By tracking Pamela growth from a gardener in the first part to a gardener who grafts in the second part, I will first examine how Richardson uses grafting's associations with writing and self-improvement to construct his authorship. Once grafting is identified as the source domain through which Richardson understands authorship, I will use one particular entailment of the domain—grafting's association with cuckoldry—to explore the ways in which Richardson's grafting metaphor, while reinterpreting the CULTIVATION metaphor, alludes to and problematizes the BIRTHING metaphor.

Gardening and Writing in Pamela

Pamela is, first and foremost, a writer who never stops writing. At first, her incessant writing greatly annoys Mr. B., who complains that "This girl is always scribbling" (*P* 54). Gradually, Pamela's writing enamors her master by revealing her innate virtue, thus enabling her to marry Mr. B. As she slowly ascends the social ladder, Pamela adopts a new identity that subtly parallels and foreshadows the development of her authorial identity: the gardener. Pamela does not ostensibly engage in any gardening until the second volume when she is imprisoned in the Lincolnshire estate, but her ties with gardening begin much earlier in the novel in the form of embroidering. After the warm scene where Mr. B. makes several unsuccessful advances in the summer-house, Pamela writes to her mother to assure her that "I have not been idle; but had writ from time to time, how he, by sly mean degrees, exposed his wicked views. . . . And yet I work very hard with my needle, upon his linen, and the fine linen of the family; and am, besides, about flowering him a waistcoat" (*P* 54). This "flowering" of the waistcoat could be read as Pamela's earliest act of gardening, for, as Susan Groag Bell argues, "the flower gardens of women of the eighteenth century live mostly in their letters, in their garden notebooks, in their botanical paintings, and in their embroideries" (481). While she is empowered as an author by being associated with gardening, a respectable profession and hobby in the eighteenth-century society, Pamela's authorship is ultimately undermined by her inapt gardening skills.

Pamela's true association with gardening begins when she tends to the horse-beans and sunflowers in Mr. B.'s Lincolnshire garden. Having selected a small plot of land for her personal cultivation, Pamela plants horse-beans to demarcate "the border . . .

[of] my garden" and admonishes the servant to not dig them up (*P* 176).[2] As she plans escape from the Lincolnshire estate, Pamela acquires Mr. Williams's promise of help and clandestinely corresponds with the pastor by hiding her letters in a corner of the garden by the "parsley-bed" and sun-flower (*P* 159). The sunflower, linked to the hope of escape, becomes the "loveliest" and "propitious" flower for Pamela (*P* 168). The sunflower plays such a vital role that Pamela terms her papers with Mr. Williams "the sun-flower correspondence" (*P* 180). This the only epithet ever attached to Pamela's writing, and it is, in fact, fitting because of the sunflower's vitality in the garden. As Philip Miller, a famous horticulturist and a friend of Richardson's, puts in *The Gardeners Dictionary*, the sunflower is "a great Ornament to Gardens within the City; where it doth grow, in Defiance of the Smoke, better than most other Plants; and for its long Continuance in Flower, deserves a Place in most Gardens, for the sake of its Flowers for Basons, &c. to adorn Halls and Chimneys in a Season when we are at a Loss for other Flowers."[3] The sunflower's resistance to smoke and its perseverance under harsh climate represent the strength of Pamela's virtues in the face of Mr. B.'s evil designs. As a matter of fact, these physical traits of the sunflower are not foreign to most readers that Margaret Anne Doody, without referencing any horticultural texts, is able to comfortably argue that

[2] Horse-beans "are usually sown on Land which is fresh broken up, because they are of Use to break and pulverize the Ground, as also to destroy Weeds; so that the Land is rendered much better for Corn, after a Crop of Beans, than it would have been before" (Miller). Horse-beans may have little or no commercial value as commodities, but they are auxiliary to increasing the value of the crops planted afterwards on the same plot. Similarly, Pamela ameliorates Mr. B.'s house by weeding out his vices, elevating his reputation among his peers, and producing virtuous children for him.

[3] Erasmus Reich, a Leipzig bookseller, visited Richardson in 1757 to persuade Richardson to publish his letters in Germany. During his visit, he recalls meeting a Mr. Miller, "author of the Gardener's Dictionary, (which has been translated at Nurnburg, with such success)" on a Sunday at Richardson's country seat (*Correspondence* 1:clxix).

Pamela's "is quite definitely a common garden sunflower, cheerful but not fragrant, nor very beautiful. . . . It is not a languorous flower, and its sturdy brightness, with its suggestion of optimism, makes the sunflower a fitting emblem of Pamela herself" (*A Natural Passion* 55). Yet Miller's account contains another aspect of the flower that, perhaps unbeknownst to Richardson, prefigures Pamela's rise to and acceptance by the upper class. In his entry for the sunflower, Miller starts by recounting the history of how the species was introduced to England and how this part of history had been forgotten by many:

> All these species of Sun-flowers are Natives of *America* . . . and it is very remarkable, that there is not a single Species of this Genus that is *European*; so that before *America* was discovered, we were wholly unacquainted with these Plants. But although they are not originally of our own Growth; yet are they become so familiar with our Climate, as to thrive and increase full as well as if they were Home . . . and many of them are now so plentiful in *England*, that Persons unacquainted with the History of these Plants would imagine them at least to have been Inhabitants of this Island many hundred Years. ("CORONA SOLIS; The Sun-Flower")

The acclimatizing history of sunflower offers an analogy to the social movement so important and controversial in *Pamela*. It may be argued that the sunflower is the ideal symbol for Pamela because both adapt to new environments without leaving any traces. As we see in the latter half of volume two, Mr. B.'s noble friends and neighbors are always amazed by Pamela's humble birth and the ease with which she carries herself among Mr. B.'s peers. Without knowing the humble history of Pamela, nobody would

imagine that she was not raised to be a lady, just like none would imagine that sunflowers have been "Inhabitants of this Island many hundred Years."

After the marriage, Pamela no longer does any literal gardening during the remainder of her stay in Lincolnshire, but as a newlywed wife, she develops figurative gardening skills, especially grafting, to manage her relationship with Mr. B. After a long lecture where Mr. B. pontificates on nearly every single aspect of a wife's duty, Pamela thanks him for the rules and turns to record them in her journal because "it will sink the impression still deeper; and I shall have recourse to my papers for my better regulation, as often as I shall mistrust my memory" (*P* 467). She writes down forty-eight rules from "this awful lecture" (*P* 467). Richardson arranges these rules in numerical order from 1 to 48. Within each entry, Mr. B.'s rule is presented first, and then Pamela's response, if any, is appended in italics with a dash to separate it from the actual rule. Nancy Armstrong claims that "[t]he effect of inserting Pamela's written presence into Mr. B's text as if she were equal to the dominant class is the effect of *supplementation*" (115, my emphasis). Armstrong's language of insertion and supplementation is suggestive of the grafting process, of appending scions (Pamela's responses) to the stock (Mr. B's lecture). Visually, the dashes look like scions, so the typography of this section suggests a series of grafts made by Pamela on Mr. B's ideas. Psychologically, Pamela prepares Mr. B.'s rules as a gardener would prune his scions. Since Pamela is summarizing, not transcribing, Mr. B.'s words in her journal, the process involves a great amount of condensation and reduction, of pruning the superfluous and keeping the essential.

Pamela's typographical and psychological grafts entail a subtle yet significant reversal of roles. We find in Pamela's grafts her reckoning of and negotiation with

Mr. B's injunctions. Of the forty-eight rules, nineteen contain no italics; three have italics on just a single word in the sentence, possibly to show emphasis or scorn. Of those entries where longer passages of Pamela's own thoughts are found, about half of the notes express Pamela's agreement to Mr. B's teachings, with expressions like "*I will be sure to remember this*" and "*That I certainly shall*" (*P* 467). Two contain Pamela's notes to self ("Memorandum"), one a reminder for future conduct—"*if any part of children's education fall to my lot, I never indulge or humour them in things that they ought to be restrained in*"—and the other for quotes to put into her commonplace book—"*A good image of unhappy wedlock, in the words,* YAWING HUSBAND, *and* VAPOURISH WIFE" (*P* 467, 468).[4] Though these entries show Pamela's own thoughts in the form of agreement, they concern more memorization as in rote learning than presenting an active mind at work that tries to engage with the information provided. We do get glimpses of Pamela's active, independent mind in some of the entries. Rule 15 stipulates that "[u]ndutiful and perverse children . . . generally make bad husbands and wives," to which Pamela adds "*And, most probably, bad masters and mistresses*" (*P* 468). Here Pamela demonstrates her ability to make extrapolations based on her previous experience and observation as a servant. In Rule 46, she connects it with an earlier rule: "*This is of the same nature with the third*" (*P* 470). Nowhere is Pamela's independent mind more active than when she questions and challenges Mr. B.'s lessons. She poses questions about contexts and applicability: "*This may be a little hard, as the case may be circumstanced*";

[4] Pamela's use of the conditional mood ("if") in the first of the memorandums is peculiar. It is as if she did not expect that Mr. B's education philosophy would be applied to their children, or that she would be actually responsible for their education.

"*But may not there by some occasions, where this may be a little dispensed with?*" (*P* 467, 469). Commenting on the notion that a man can expect from his wife "what is reasonable and just," Pamela asks, "*Yet who, all this time, is to be the judge?*" (*P* 469). She brings up the same question about the arbiter of standard when, responding to a wife's complaisance to her husband and her free agency, she interrogates, "*Yet, again I ask–Who is to be the judge?*" (*P* 469). If these questions about judgment reveal her challenge to Mr. B.'s doctrines, Pamela casts away any vestige of restraint when she criticizes Rules 24 and 30:

> *A hard lesson, I doubt, where one's judgment is not convinced. We all dearly love to be thought in the right, in any debated point. I am afraid this doctrine, if enforced, would tend to make an honest wife a hypocrite!* (*P* 469)
>
> *I don't know what to say to this! It looks a little hard, methinks! This would bear a smart debate, I fancy, in a parliament of women.* (*P* 469)

These are Pamela's most vociferous criticisms of Mr. B., and they show that Pamela is not simply a meek, obedient wife; she is capable of independent thinking and subversion. Interspersed among Mr. B.' awful rules, Pamela's notes on the doctrines reveal a young woman trying to come to terms with her new identity and responsibilities. In the beginning of the lecture notes, Pamela identifies strongly with the ideal wife, as she keeps summarizing the rules in the form of "I must" or "I must not." About a fourth into the notes, that cautious, determined first-person voice quietly disappears. In its stead, Pamela uses the indefinite, distanced third person of "a wife" or simply "she" in her summaries. The transition from first to third person is subtle, but it betrays a quiet separation of

Pamela's self-identity from that of an ideal wife portrayed by Mr. B., as she becomes more critical of the rules and doctrines. On the surface, Pamela seems to play the obedient wife perfectly, agreeing to everything Mr. B. says, yet her notes contain seeds of subversion that could potentially turn her into an entirely different character. Richardson endows Pamela with certain awareness and autonomy, but he never allows her to become anything more than an obedient wife.[5]

While Pamela's social and authorial identities are conferred with prestige by the gardening attribute, they are simultaneously undermined because she is not a skillful or knowledgeable gardener. First, her enthusiasm for horse-beans is misplaced, probably because she mistakes horse-beans as a kind of salad greens for the dining table. This explains why Joseph, the gardener, smiles at her attention to the horse-beans (*P* 176). Second, Pamela betrays her horticultural ignorance when she stoops to smell the sunflowers which, as one maid notes, "don't smell" (*P* 165). After studying a series of gardening images, Doody also concludes that "Pamela is not a very good gardener" (*A Natural Passion* 56). It should not be surprising that Pamela is an inapt gardener, for she only takes up gardening out of expedience to plan her escape.[6] Despite her various attempts at gardening, both literally and figuratively, Pamela's gardener identity is

[5] In the sequel, Pamela recalls the awful lecture and refers to it as "the noblest and earliest Curtain-lecture" (*P2* 52–53). Rivero notices the subtle gender inversion here when he explains that Samuel Johnson defines a curtain-lecture as "[a] reproof given by a wife to her husband in bed." Rivero concludes that "Pamela wittily—or perhaps ignorantly—reverses the usual gender co-ordinates of the term" (670n).

[6] If we examine Pamela's relationship with gardening more comprehensively in the first two volumes of the novel, we will find that she is more often on the figurative receiving end of gardening as a flower (*P* 321, 492). For how early eighteenth-century garden manuals and books marginalized women's labor by depicting them as flowers, see Rebecca W. Bushnell, *Green Desire: Imagining Early Modern English Gardens* (Cornell UP, 2003), 131. For the importance of the flower trope in the development of the novel as a genre, especially in the second half of the eighteenth century when Carl Linnaeus's theory of plants' sexual reproduction became popular in Britain, see Amy King, *Bloom: The Botanical Vernacular in the English Novel* (Oxford UP, 2003).

ultimately reduced to a joke, as Mr. B. introduces her to his Bedfordshire servants as "a mistress that is a great gardener. She will shew you a new way to plant beans: and never any body had such a hand at improving a sun-flower, as she" (*P* 487). Granted, Pamela's misguided investment in sunflowers and horse-beans demonstrates how little she knows about gardening, but it was never her intention to take gardening seriously. Gardener is a role Pamela adopts out of expedience to protect and nurture her writing. The irony of Pamela's strategy lies in the fact that, instead of cementing her authorial identity, it actually undermines her agency. Pamela's inapt gardener identity is mirrored by the waning quality of her writing toward the end. After the climax of marriage, the novel continues, but with little energy or action. Armstrong observes that "the last third of *Pamela* deals with little else but the details of household management," and that Pamela's writing style "waxes suddenly stuffy, static, and both patronizing and obsequious, displaying all those qualities, in short, that made conduct books themselves seem so empty and tedious to read once their historical moment had passed" (109, 124). At the end of the first part of the novel, Pamela's writing and gardening are revealed to be intertwined and almost symbiotic: they empower each other through association, but both suffer qualitative declines once the ultimate goal—marriage—is achieved.

Grafting and Writing in Pamela II

At the beginning of *Pamela II*, Lady Davers urges Pamela to delegate household management to her servants so that she can "write to entertain and instruct" (*P2* 32). To

illustrate how writing improves one's character and knowledge, Lady Davers develops the grafting metaphor into great length:

> So that reading constantly, and thus using yourself to write, which impress'd you more than Reading could, and enjoying besides the Benefit of a good Memory, everything you heard or read became your own; and not only so, but improved by passing thro' more salubrious Ducts and Vehicles; like some fine Fruit grafted upon a common Free-stock, whose more exuberant Juices serve to bring to quicker and greater Perfection the downy Peach, or the smooth Nectarine with its crimson Blush. (*P2* 40)

Writing is, as Lady Davers explains, a means to process and take ownership of knowledge and experience one gains through reading or living in the world. In this metaphor, "everything you heard or read" is the scion of "some fine Fruit," and writing, when practiced skillfully as a gardener administers grafting successfully, facilitates the educational process and brings about virtues, as the valuable peaches and nectarines. Lady Davers's grafting metaphor retroactively describes Pamela's typographical graftings on Mr. B.'s rules in the awful lecture in the first part of the novel. The grafting metaphor opens up associations with writing and self-improvement, and it foreshadows Pamela's authorial growth as evidenced by her two "little Books."

Grafting had long been one of the most basic and essential techniques for gardening in medieval and early modern England. In *The History of Gardens*, Christopher Thacker calls grafting "a medieval enthusiasm" because people were enraptured by the fantastical promise of growing different fruits on a single tree (85). In medieval England, gardeners developed the techniques of grafting and learned very early

how to graft pears on hawthorns (Cecil 52). Grafting was so essential to gardening that the very first printed book on horticulture, *The crafte of graffynge & plantynge of trees* (1518), treats the subject extensively and opens with a passage on growing coreless fruits: "TO graffe fruyte that shall haue no core. Take a graffe and bow it both ends combing, & cut both ends graf wyse, & so fasten them into the stoke." Grafting came to be associated with writing because, for early modern gardeners, grafting meant an act of creation, assisted or often inflamed by their wildest imaginations. Tracing the etymological roots of grafting and writing, Jacques Derrida notes that "One ought to explore systematically not only what appears to be a simple etymological coincidence uniting the graft and the graph (both from *graphion*: writing implement, stylus), but also the analogy between the forms of textual grafting and so-called vegetal grafting, or even, more and more commonly today, animal grafting" (*Dissemination* 202).[7] William Shakespeare uses the grafting metaphor for the rejuvenating power of writing in Sonnet 15, where the speaker promises the addressee that, despite the devastations of time, he can always "ingraft you new" (14). Since grafting involves attaching an external object to the stock, it can be used to describe a text's relationships to other texts. In his *Argalus and Parthenia* (1629), a continuation of Philip Sidney's prose fiction *Arcadia*, Francis Quarles describes his work as "a *Sience* taken out of the Orchard of Sir *Philip Sydney* . . . Which I haue lately grafted vpon a Crab-stocke, in mine owne."[8]

[7] For Derrida's discussions of grafting in relation to language and dissemination, see "Signature Event Context," in *Limited Inc* (Northwestern UP, 1988), 9, 21; and *Dissemination* (U of Chicago P, 1981), 151, 202, 203, 234, 299, 304, 354–56.

[8] Pamela's name can be traced back to Sidney's character, princess Pamela, in *Arcadia*. See Jacob Leed, "Richardson's Pamela and Sidney's," *Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association* 40, no. 1 (1973): 240–45; and Gillian Beer, *"Pamela*: Rethinking *Arcadia*," in *Samuel*

Grafting's metaphorical association with growth had a long biblical tradition, but grafting was increasingly cultivated for self-improvement among the genteel in the eighteenth century. In Romans, Paul compares Jews and Gentiles to branches cut from wild and good olives trees respectively: "For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree, how much more shall these, which are the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?" (11:24). The Pauline trope of God-as-grafter is the foundation of Quarles's "On Grapes," where the poet compares men to grapes and God to the gardener:

> We are thy *Vineyard*, Lord; These Grapes of our,
> By *Nature*, are degenerous and sower;
> But if thou please to *graft* us, we shall beare
> Delicious fruit; which being prest, shall cheare
> The hearts of *Angels*, and that blessed *Trine*
> Of perfect glory with their sprightly *Wine*[9]

In the social lives of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century gentlemen and gentlewomen, gardening was praised as a means to acquire knowledge and improve character. As Rebecca W. Bushnell concludes, "the culture of fruit and flowers, in short, was a form of 'cultivation,' whereby men and women could produce beauty and profit from the land,

---

Richardson: Tercentenary Essays, ed. Margaret Anne Doody and Peter Sabor (Cambridge UP, 1989), 23–39.

[9] For how Lady Davers's grafting metaphor can be situated in the tradition of seventeenth-century devotional poetry, of which Quarles's "On Grapes" is an example, see Louise Curran, *Samuel Richardson and the Art of Letter-Writing* (Cambridge UP, 2016), 39. Quarles's grafting metaphor highlights the religious connection between grafting and wine, and some of Richardson's phrasing ("impress'd," "Ducts and Vehicles") also evokes images of wine making. For the connection between grafting and wine, Richardson may have been influenced by Aaron Hill, who grew and grafted grapes in his own vineyard. See Hill's letter to Richardson (17 Sept. 1740, *Correspondence* 1:47–48).

yet also advance or transform themselves" (34). Women had long worked in domestic gardens to grow greens for the kitchen table since the early modern period, but, starting from the eighteenth century, upper-class ladies were encouraged to garden not for the practical reason of producing food, but for moral education and self-improvement, just like their male counterparts had been advised to do since the seventeenth century. Stephen Switzer, a professional gardener, landscape designer, and one of the most renowned authors of horticulture in the first half of the eighteenth century, extols the benefits of gardening for country gentlemen in his *Ichnographia Rustica* (1718): "'Tis there Reason, Judgment, and Hands are so busily employed, as to leave no room for any vain or trifling Thoughts to interrupt their sweet Retirement" (v). Meanwhile, Switzer is also cognizant that "[i]t would be an unpardonable Omission, not to mention those Virtuous and Honourable Persons amongst the Ladies, who have likewise shewn a particular Veneration and Esteem for the Subject we are upon" (71). While upper-class women were encouraged to garden in the eighteenth century, they were not always instructed to graft. In Book XIX of *The Female Spectator*, Eliza Haywood praises the benefits of gardening and urges her readers to take up the hobby. "Among all the Occupations of Gardening," she says, "there is none so astonishing as grafting; and we never can too much admire the force of that genial juice, which in a small sprig taken off one tree and grafted into another, still remains its primitive nature" (4:49–50).

Haywood's advice is strikingly similar to Lady Davers's, not only for their celebration of grafting, but also for their shared emphasis on the exuberant/genial juice, namely, the sap. It is true that Lady Davers is prescribing, not describing, a model of writing for Pamela, but the grafting metaphor epitomizes Pamela's new identity as an

improved gardener in *Pamela II*, as demonstrated in her writing of the two little books. At the requests of Lady Davers and Mr. B., she compiles one book for her thoughts on theater and another on education. As she explains in a letter to Lady Davers, Pamela will include in her little Book "my poor Observations on all the Dramatick Entertainments I have seen" with the help of the "brief Notes in the Margin of the printed Plays I have bought" (*P2* 369). In three successive letters, Pamela reviews a comedy, a tragedy, and an Italian opera, which are representatives of the most popular genres in eighteenth-century British theater. The other little book is more essential to Pamela's identity as an author. Mr. B. assigns John Locke's *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* for Pamela's perusal as they prepare for their children's education. As a diligent student and obedient wife, Pamela annotates Locke's text and explains her opinions in her letters to Mr. B. From these letters, we can see that Pamela is still seeking Mr. B.'s approval and teaching, as she has done in the awful lecture in the first part of the novel. For example, when contemplating on the format of the little book, Pamela plans to "leave one Side of the Leaf blank for your [Mr. B.'s] Corrections and Alterations" (*P2* 541). Pamela's submissive gesture towards Mr. B. mirrors a similar incident between Richardson and his correspondents, Astraea and Minerva Hill, daughters of Richardson's friend Aaron Hill. Richardson sent several sheets of his *Pamela* with interleaving blank pages to the sisters and asked for their suggestions or corrections. In their reply to Richardson, Astraea and Minerva write:

> And the only Wise and reasonable use we can presume to make of your permission to inscribe our notes, upon those interleav'd White Emblems of her Innocence, will be to fill em with progressive memorandums of the Benefits her

> Conversation brings us,— How kind, and how instructive therefore have you been, good Sir, who (when we wanted Room to say the thousandth Part of what we felt for Pamela, in one short, single sheet of Paper) have bestow'd upon us a well-placed succession of Blank Pages, to receive our Admiration while its Force is new and warm: and our touch'd Hearts continue fill'd, with the whole Joy of the Impression. (qtd. in Brewer 150)

This letter is dated December 30, 1740, one month after the publication of the first edition of *Pamela* in November 1740, so we may safely assume that the sheets Richardson sent to the Hill sisters were manuscripts of *Pamela II*, which was then still a work in progress. What Richardson asked of the Hill sisters is essentially the same as what Pamela asks of Mr. B. Richardson did not receive any corrections or alterations, nor does Pamela—at least we never find Mr. B.'s suggestions as he so often does in the first part. Hence, the author-reader relationship between Pamela and Mr. B. replicates that between Richardson and the Hill sisters, with one notable difference: the gender roles and powers are reversed. Pamela thus becomes, like Richardson, the authoritative figure, while her reader is silenced.[10]

If we compare Pamela's reading and writing about Locke with her reception of Mr. B.'s awful lessons in the first part, we can see that Pamela's authorial independence waxes as Mr. B.'s presence gradually wanes. In the course of eight letters (LI to LVIII), Pamela expounds at great length her thoughts on education and Locke's work. Does Mr. B. approve of or correct Pamela's reading of Locke? We do not know because

[10] For Richardson's revisions of *Pamela*, see Eaves and Kimpel 102–10, 122–25. For how Richardson solicited contributions or suggestions from his correspondents only to disregard them, see David A. Brewer, *The Afterlife of Character, 1726–1825* (U of Pennsylvania P, 2005), 121–24. For how Richardson revised *Pamela* according to the suggestions he received from his coterie, see Hilary Havens, *Revising the Eighteenth-Century Novel: Authorship from Manuscript to Print* (Cambridge UP, 2019), 20–54.

Pamela never describes his responses in any of the letters. In fact, Mr. B. almost disappears entirely from the novel starting from Letter LI. The only direct reference to Mr. B. is made when Pamela relates to her parents that Mr. B. is planning to take Pamela to tour the Continent after her giving birth to their daughter. In effect, Mr. B. is completely silenced in the last third of *Pamela II*. This contrasts sharply with the awful lecture in the first part, where Mr. B.'s presence and authority are strongly in every letter and journal. As a writer, Pamela evidently undergoes tremendous growth in *Pamela II* at the expense of Mr. B. The gardening imagery that we find in *Pamela* disappears almost entirely, except for Lady Davers's grafting metaphor, which serves as a powerful model to which Pamela aspires and with which we can better understand Pamela's authorial identity. The grafting metaphor is significant because it marks a progress on the part of Pamela as a writer. If Pamela is a gardener of sunflowers and horse-beans, plants found in the flower and kitchen gardens, in the First Part, her movement towards grafting in the Second Part associates her with orchards, the cultivation of which was considered masculine in the eighteenth century. Therefore, through being associated with the image of a gardener who grafts, Pamela is moving towards a more masculine conception of authorship.

Cuckolds and Bastards

If the grafting metaphor is presented as authorial empowerment in *Pamela*, Richardson casts the metaphor in an entirely different light in his letters. Intent on

forestalling "scandalous Attempts of Ingrafting upon his Plan," Richardson announces in the advertisement to *Pamela II*

> That all the Copies of Mrs. B.'s Observation and Writings, upon every subject hinted at in the preceding Four Volumes, and in particular those relating to *Devotion, Education, Plays,* &c. are now in *One Hand Only:* And that, *if ever* they shall be published, (which at present is a Point undertermined [*sic*]) it must not be, till after a certain Event, as unwished, as deplorable: and *then*, solely, at the Assignment of SAMUEL RICHARDSON, of *Salisbury-Court, Fleetstreet*, the Editor of these Four Volumes of *PAMELA*; or, VIRTUE REWARDED. (qtd. in Simonova 139)

Presenting himself as Pamela's executor, Richardson invokes the protection of the law to assert his ownership over Pamela's story and character. Though he never uses the grafting metaphor to describe his revisions or continuation of *Pamela*, Richardson is clearly aware of the metaphor's aptitude for such descriptions. When Philip Skelton suggests adding to *Sir Charles Grandison* "a bad woman, expensive, imperious, lewd, and at last a drammer" (10 May 1751, *Correspondence* 5:211), Richardson replies, "I thank you, my dear friend, for your agreeable warmth in relation to the bad woman to be ingrafted in my story. . . . I demand your assistance, my dear Mr. Skelton: assemble your dozen devils, and take them off for me; and if I can ingraft them in my story, down they go." (19 Feb. 1752, *Correspondence* 5:213). Richardson never adopted Skelton's suggestion.

When using the grafting metaphor to criticize imitations of *Pamela*, Richardson is fixated on the pecuniary and sexual aspects of the metaphor, which culminates in his describing Fielding's *Joseph Andrews* as "a lewd and ungenerous engraftment." The

pecuniary and sexual implications reveal two asymmetries in Richardson's uses of the grafting metaphor in his novels and his letters. First, Richardson's concern over lost profit originates from his being a publishing author in the literary marketplace, but it is inconsistent with grafting's social function of self-improvement, the basis of Richardson's grafting metaphor in *Pamela II*. Switzer educates his eighteenth-century readers that "Agriculture and Gard'ning, abstracted from the Profits of it, was so very solid, durable, and delightful an Employ, plac'd above the most refined Pleasures of Antiquity" (1:iii). Observing a paradigm shift in the long eighteenth century, Bushnell argues that

> Unlike the case posed by the sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century writers, who drew on the formula of 'profit and delight' in justifying garden work, when addressing horticulture for gentlemen the later books suppressed the value of use in its justification. The very vanity of the work lent it its highest value insofar as the path to knowledge of God, self, or nature's secrets remained uncontaminated by the vulgarity of "petty profit." (107)

Since Pamela is part of the gentry after her marriage, she is allowed to disregard profit, a luxury Richardson could not afford. Second, grafting's association with lewdness, which has a long literary tradition, seems entirely absent from *Pamela*. This asymmetry, I argue, masks Richardson's anxiety about the BIRTHING metaphor, an alternative model of authorship that Pamela represents through her writing's metonymic relationships with pregnancies and childbirths. Richardson may be able to control Pamela's births—of both children and writing—in his novels, but he loses the control as soon as *Pamela* entered the literary marketplace as a commodity.

In literature, the grafting metaphor is often used to describe the union of two individuals in love or marriage. For instance, when remarking on how women are married into other families, Margaret Cavendish writes: "Daughters are but branches which by marriage are broken off from the root from whence they sprang and engrafted into the stock of another family" (65). As though its association with variety was translated into promiscuity, grafting is also used to describe cuckoldry. In his *Dictionarium Britannicum* (1730), Nathan Bailey, an early eighteenth-century lexicographer, defines a cuckold as "one whose wife's lewd pranks vulgarly said to graft horns on his head." Shakespeare explores the grafting metaphor's implications of cuckoldry in *Henry V*. Horrified by Hal's invasion and victory in France, the Dauphin, son of the French King, calls the British army "Our scions, put in wild and savage stock," who have now come to "overlook their grafters" (3.5.7, 9).The British, who are but "bastard Normans, Norman bastards" (3.5.10), effeminate French men by attracting French women "To new-store France with bastard warriors" (3.5.31). In *The Rape of Lucrece*, Lucrece promises Collatine that she will bring no bastard into the world: "This bastard graff shall never come to growth. / He shall not boast who did thy stock pollute, / That thou art doting father of his fruit" (1062–64). "When it came to matters of sex and reproduction," Bushnell observes about Shakespeare's use of the grafting metaphor, "the connotations were almost always unpleasant, associated with bastards and cuckoldry" (148).[11]

[11] For the grafting metaphor in Shakespeare's works, see Erin Ellerbeck, "Adoption and the Language of Horticulture in *All's Well That Ends Well*," *SEL* 51, no. 2 (May 2011): 305–26; Jean E. Feerick, "The Imperial Graft: Horticulture, Hybridity, and the Art of Mingling Races in *Henry V* and *Cymbeline*," in *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Embodiment: Gender, Sexuality, and Race*, ed. Valerie Traub,

In *Pamela*, Mr. B. uses the grafting metaphor to characterize his sister's marriage to Lord Davers as being "ingrafted into" the house of Davers (*P* 441).[12] Pamela never cuckolds Mr. B., nor does she mother any bastards. From the first part of the novel, her writing is consistently associated with her body and childbirth. While in captivity in Lincolnshire, Pamela keeps writing in secret in defiance of Mr. B.'s injunction. Her papers "grow bulky: [so] I stitch them hitherto in my under-coat, next my linen" (*P* 168). Pamela's body grows with her writings as if in pregnancy. McKeon maintains that "Richardson evokes the two means of creativity and self-expression traditionally and normatively available to women, childbirth and dress, even as he goes beyond them to suggest an analogous but emergent alternative: the female arts as exemplary self-representation through writing" (649). The affinity between her body and writing becomes conspicuous when Mr. B. threatens to strip her to find the writings (*P* 271). Mr. B. is obsessed with Pamela's papers because he has a relentless desire to read everything Pamela has written, to learn every thought of Pamela's, be they approbative or critical of his character. It is like an addiction, an insatiable restlessness: "I *must* see them . . . or I shall never be easy" (*P* 267). Armstrong underscores this textual-bodily transformation when she argues that Richardson "transforms [Pamela's] erotic and permeable body into a self-enclosed body of words. Mr. B's repeated failures suggest that

(Oxford UP, 2016), 211–27; Vin Nardizzi, "Shakespeare's Penknife: Grafting and Seedless Generation in the Procreation Sonnets," *Renaissance and Reformation* 32, no. 1 (2009): 83–106; and Miranda Wilson, "Bastard Grafts, Crafted Fruits: Shakespeare's Planted Families," in *The Indistinct Human in Renaissance Literature*, ed. Jean E. Feerick and Vin Nardizzi (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 101–17.

[12] Clarissa also uses the grafting metaphor to describe the challenges marriage poses for women: "Marriage is a very solemn engagement, enough to make a young creature's heart ache, with the best prospects, when she thinks seriously of it!—To be given up to a strange man; to be engrafted into a strange family; to give up her very name, as a mark of her becoming his absolute and dependent property: to be obliged to prefer this strange man to father, mother—to everybody: and his humours to all her own" (*Clarissa* 148–49).

Pamela cannot be raped because she is nothing but words" (116). The metonymic connection between writing and pregnancy is further developed in *Pamela II*, in the letters where Pamela describes how she prepares for her little book on education. In the course of recounting her opinions on Locke and education, Pamela casually mentions that she has just given birth to their daughter, who is named after her (*P2* 548). In other words, Pamela's writing grows in tandem with her pregnancy. The inherent association between writing and pregnancy or offspring, at least on the subject of education, is observed by Pamela when she writes: "altho' I shall be Years in writing it, perhaps, as the dear Babies improve, and as I improve, by the Opportunities which their Advances in Years will give me, and the Experiences I shall gain" (*P2* 541). As a woman, Pamela authors both figurative and literal children in the novel.

Richardson allows Pamela to embody the BIRTHING metaphor because her body and writing are both under strict control in the novel, thereby without any danger of cuckoldry. But before Richardson's anxiety about the BIRTHING metaphor is on full display in his letters, it percolates into the novel and manifests in one particular letter in *Pamela II*. On the eve of giving birth to her first child, Pamela writes a letter (Letter XX) "seal'd with black Wax," gives it to Miss Danrford, her confident, and instructs her "to give to Mr. B. if she dies" (*P2* 380). After Pamela gives birth to a son, Miss Darnford, overwhelmed by joy, gives the letter to Mr. B., who refuses to return it and says that "he will obtain Mrs. *B*'s Leave, when she is better, to open it" (*P2* 381). When Pamela asks for the letter not long after, Mr. B., having procured Pamela's consent to open and read the letter, decides not to read it and returns it to Pamela, who then gives it to Lady Davers at the latter's request. The prospective reader of this will is transferred from Mr. B. to

Lady Davers, and it is no longer intended to be read after Pamela's death. With Pamela's recovery, the will loses its urgency and, partially, its association with death. It becomes more like any other ordinary letter of Pamela's that attests to her virtue. Still, we need to ask: Does Lady Davers ever read the will? She never makes any reference to its contents in any of her successive letters, but we can assume that, given her enthusiasm for Pamela's writing, she will eventually read it, though maybe not immediately after Pamela's recovery. There should be little doubt that no one has read Letter XX at the exact moment of its appearance in the novel. Miss Darnford has had the physical copy of the letter, but she never breaks the seal; Mr. B. abdicates his right to it; and Lady Davers defers her reading until some undetermined time in the future. At this moment, Letter XX exists in a vacuum: it is written by Pamela but is read by none. It also begs the question: How do we, the readers of *Pamela II*, gain access to the contents of the letter? If the letter is not immediately read or responded to by a certain reader, and if it is not enclosed in another letter in the form of transcript, then nobody should have knowledge of its contents, except Pamela the writer herself. Clearly, Letter XX's existence is an example of Richardson's editorial grafting, which we have only seen but once in Volume I.[13] The proximity among Pamela's writing, birth, and death around Letter XX reveals the underside of the BIRTHING metaphor: an author could fail to publish or control their publication in so many ways as infertility, maternal death, adultery, and bastardy.[14]

---

[13] Between Letters XXXI and XXXII, the editor [i.e. Richardson] presents himself abruptly because he deems that "it is necessary the reader should know" that "[t]he intriguing gentleman [Mr. B.] thought fit to keep back from her father her three last letters [XXIX to XXXI]" (*P* 123).

[14] The relationship between writing, disease, and death may be located in grafting, which acquired the meaning of inoculating someone against smallpox in the eighteenth century. In *Clarissa*, Richardson describes how a certain letter "gives the servant the small-pox: and she has given it to her unhappy

"A Piece of Writing Only"

Critics have frequently commented on Richardson's use of the grafting metaphor in his responses to Kelly and Fielding, but they seem to have neglected another application of the metaphor in Richardson's letters: geniuses of the English literature. In 1749, Thomas Newton, bishop of Bristol, published his variorum edition of John Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Richardson was not impressed by Newton's edition. On the contrary, he laments that "I cannot bear, that another of Apollo's genuine Offspring should pass down to future Times with such crude and unworthy Notes. His Engraftment . . . will hinder worthier Attempts" (To Thomas Edwards, 19 March 1751, *SL* 176). Here Richardson considers Newton's paratextual devices, the "crude and unworthy Notes," to be an engraftment upon Milton's work. It seems that Richardson is furious because Newton's edition fails to do justice to Milton's genius, but his fury results from a more practical reason, as he accuses Newton of intending to "depreciate, and yet clog with Expence, the glorious Milton" (*SL* 176). As it turns out, market values, especially in terms of author's profits, lie at the heart of Richardson's complaint. This is made explicit when Richardson criticizes Newton "for abusing Milton worse than Lauder, to get 1000 Guineas; for what the Author could not procure 90!" (*SL* 176). Seeing himself as a guardian of the English masters, Richardson pleads that "Spenser, Milton, Shakespeare, may be handed down in their unborrowed Lights to latest Times!—Or that Posterity, and Foreigners, who now begin to taste the Value of our Language, may know, that when

---

vapourish lady" (659). As a piece of writing, the letter becomes the vehicle for spreading smallpox and, by extension, death.

Attempts were made to engraft unworthy Names on their Fame, there were Persons living, who entered their Protests against them!" (*SL* 176). Richardson uses the grafting metaphor to present Spenser, Milton, and Shakespeare as original geniuses, as the stock of English literature, that is, the canon.

When David A. Brewer analyzes Pamela's migrations from Richardson's text to other unauthorized continuations, he observes that "there seems to have been something in Richardson's work which called out for engraftment, even if it did not guarantee adherence to Richardson's terms" (129). Picking up on Richardson's grafting metaphor, he concludes that Richardson "was the arborist charged with tending to the trunk upon which readers' various engraftments were being made" (144). Despite not explicitly developing the grafting metaphor into a coherent model of authorship, Richardson uses expressions of grafting so consistently that it becomes clear that his understanding of his authorial identity is based on the metaphor. With the source domain of grafting, we gain a deeper understanding of Richardson's authorship through grafting's three entailments. First, grafting's association with writing provides Richardson with a long tradition on which he draws to conceptualize his authorial identity as well as Pamela's. Second, grafting's entailment of self-improvement, the fashioning of the eighteenth-century gentry, exposes the incompatibility between Pamela's and Richardson's authorships. Unlike Pamela, Richardson writes to generate profit in the literary marketplace, hence his complaints about works being depreciated. Finally, grafting's entailment of cuckoldry reveals Richardson's anxiety about the BIRTHING metaphor. Pamela's literal and figurative pregnancies and births in the novel are manifestations of the BIRTHING metaphor. Outside the tightly controlled space of *Pamela*, the BIRTHING metaphor

rarely manifests in Richardson's letters. It does in one letter where Richardson, comparing *Pamela* with *Clarissa* and *Sir Charles Grandison*, asserts that

> I will give Pamela my last Correction, if my Life be spared; that, as a Piece of Writing only, she may not appear, for her Situation, unworthy of her Younger Sisters. . . . who, being born to their Father, when the Honest Andrewes was a little more *aforehand in the World*, as Rustics phrase it, they were put to genteeler Parts of Education, that could be afforded for the Elder Daughter before Mr. B.'s Mother took her, and laid the Foundations of the Family's better Fortune. (To Johannes Stinstra, 2 June 1753, *SL* 245)

Considering *Pamela* as his work, as "a Piece of Writing only," Richardson treats it as one of his daughters, an unmistakable expression of the BIRTHING metaphor. Richardson's identification as a father helps to illustrate how his fixation on the sexual and pecuniary aspects of grafting results from an unresolved conflict between the CULTIVATION and BIRTHING metaphors.

"A Kind of Settlement": Borrowing, Opinion, and Authorship in *Tristram Shandy*

"Writers in the Case of borrowing from others," writes Alexander Pope, "are like Trees which of themselves wou'd produce only one sort of Fruit, but by being grafted upon others, may yield variety" (1:19–20). As a literary technique, borrowing does not have an agreed upon definition and can be called many different names.[1] A general but helpful definition is provided by philosopher and musicologist Leonard B. Meyer, who asserts that borrowing occurs when "existing materials—usually fairly brief excerpts (a melody, a line or stanza of verse, or part of a painting), but sometimes larger sections or even whole works of modest size—are quoted, copied, or reproduced exactly, or almost exactly" (199). Abounding with a dizzying variety of literary borrowings, Laurence Sterne's *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy* (1759–67) has inspired many debates since its publication. In 1798, John Ferriar published the earliest study of Sterne's borrowings in *Illustrations of Sterne, with other Essays and Verses* and identified "the ludicrous writers" of France (e.g. François Rabelais, François Béroalde de Verville, and Agrippa d'Aubigné) as Sterne's main sources (7). Since Ferriar, most scholars discussed Sterne's borrowings in the tradition learned wit, from Renaissance humanists (Michel de Montaigne, Robert Burton, Miguel de Cervantes) to the Scriblerians (Alexander Pope,

[1] Similar terms include allusion, echo, and intertextuality. See Gregory Machacek, "Allusion," *PMLA* 122, no. 2 (2007): 522–36. For the metaphorical relationship between allusion and grafting, see Allan H. Pasco, *Allusion: A Literary Graft* (U of Toronto P, 1994). For how literary borrowing can be categorized into seven types—plagiarism, adaptation, retelling, parody, criticism, revision, expansion—based on what the audience knows about the original, see Peter J. Rabinowitz, "'What's Hecuba to Us?' The Audience's Experience of Literary Borrowing," in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, ed. Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman (Princeton UP, 1980), 241–63.

Jonathan Swift).[2] Melvyn New's Florida Edition of *Tristram* (1978) and *The Notes* (1984) can be seen as the epitome of this approach, for the editors attempted to thoroughly identify every author, text, or idea Sterne read and borrowed either directly or indirectly.[3] Resisting against the trend of stabilizing Sterne's intertextual relationships to other authors, Jonathan Lamb adopted a poststructuralist approach and read Sterne's borrowings as "'fragments' on fragments . . . exotic bits and pieces not as the language of an ultimately decipherable message, but as parts of a figurative arrangement whose efficacy lies in its unannotable ambiguity" (*Sterne's Fiction* 4).[4]

As different as the scholars' understandings of and approaches to Sterne's borrowings are, they all impose external frameworks (e.g. wit, poststructuralist ambiguity) on *Tristram* to make sense of the borrowings therein. Such impositions are understandable, for Sterne never explicitly states how or why he borrows so extensively. However, *Tristram* does provide some clues to deciphering Sterne's stance on borrowing, and I locate such clues in three metaphors he uses to illustrate the formation and importance of opinions, for which borrowings play a pivotal role. First, Tristram uses the

---

[2] See, for example, Howard Anderson, "Associationism and Wit in *Tristram Shandy*," *Philological Quarterly* 48, no. 1 (1969): 27–41; H. J. Jackson, "Sterne, Burton, and Ferriar: Allusions to the *Anatomy of Melancholy* in Volumes V to IV of *Tristram Shandy*," *Philological Quarterly* 54, no. 2 (1975): 457–70; Donald R. Wehrs, "Sterne, Cervantes, Montaigne: Fideistic Skepticism and the Rhetoric of Desire," *Comparative Literature Studies* 25, no. 2 (1988): 127–51; and Judith Hawley, "Tristram Shandy, Learned Wit, and Enlightenment Knowledge," in *The Cambridge Companion to Laurence Sterne* (Cambridge UP, 2009), 34–48.

[3] *The Notes* distinguish between "authors/texts and ideas . . . between those authors/texts that Sterne certainly knew and loved, and what we might call his 'index learning,' his use of encyclopedias and other works of 'reference,' from which he borrowed not only ideas but as well the names of the authors who promulgated them" ("Introduction" 7–8).

[4] Lamb protests against the Florida edition for its putting *Tristram* "in a grid of borrowings, quotations and allusions that considerably restricts the freedom to read beyond the annotated pale" (*Sterne's Fiction* 2). Thomas Keymer calls Lamb's defensiveness "the poststructuralist armour . . . in which intertextuality is an infinite field of potential relations from which readers, unconfined by authorial intention or editorial fiat, select at will" (11).

scribe metaphor to describe his writing process, a topic on which he delights in expounding. When analyzed in the eighteenth-century religious context, the scribe metaphor is exposed to be a fraud, for Sterne rejects inspiration and defends borrowing as the proper method for sermon writing. To tease out Sterne's view on borrowing and authorship, I turn to two metaphors that describe the process of forming opinions, one of the pillars of the writing and reading of *Tristram*. Sterne deliberately added *Opinions* to the title of the novel to substitute for the more common keywords such as "history" and "adventures" found in most eighteenth-century novels.[5] As Tristram explains to the reader, "I have undertaken, you see, to write not only my life, but my opinions also; hoping and expecting that your knowledge of my character, and of what kind of a mortal I am, by the one, would give you a better relish for the other" (*TS* 1.6.9). While Tristram never misses an opportunity to expand on his or other characters' opinions, he does not explain how he forms his opinions. Instead, he develops the picking-up and settlement metaphors to explain how his father, Walter Shandy, forms his opinions on noses and names. As "an excellent natural philosopher," Walter is passionate about "abstruse thinking;—the ideas of time and space,——or how we came by those ideas,——or of what stuff they were made,—or whether they were born with us——or we pick'd them up afterwards as we went along,—or whether we did it in frocks,—or not till we had got

[5] Some examples include Daniel Defoe's *The Life and Strange Surprizing Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1719); Henry Fielding's *The History of the Adventures of Joseph Andrews* (1742) and *The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling* (1749); Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa. Or the History of a Young Lady* (1747-48); Tobias Smollett's *The Adventures of Roderick Random* (1748); Eliza Haywood's *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless* (1751); and Charlotte Lennox's *The Female Quixote; Or the Adventures of Arabella* (1752). Eighteenth-century novelists, according to Gérard Genette, "avoided flaunting a status Aristotle had never heard of [i.e. the novel], and contrived to suggest their genre status more indirectly by way of parageneric titles in which the words *history*, *life*, *memoirs*, *adventures*, *voyages*, and some others generally played a role" (95)

into breeches" (*TS* 1.3.4, 3.18.223). Walter's hobby-horse, which Melanie D. Holm characterizes as "a passion for order, explanation, and learned disquisition," makes him the ideal focal point to investigate the relationship between borrowings and opinions under the larger system regarding Sterne's authorship (364). With the picking-up metaphor, Sterne demonstrates how an author develops opinions through borrowings, the labor of which constitute originality. Based on the Lockean property theory, the picking-up metaphor represents the most popular form of the CULTIVATION metaphor in the eighteenth century, but its focus on the author-work relationship makes it inadequate to conceptualize authorship in the literary marketplace. Interpreting the CULTIVATION metaphor through the source domain of parish, Sterne develops the settlement metaphor to expand the concept of authorship to a community founded on parochial sociability. By tracing the three metaphors—scribe, picking-up, and settlement—in *Tristram*, we see how Sterne uses borrowings and opinions as heuristic tools to define his authorial identity and to help the reader acquire knowledge.

The Scribal Metaphor

After the famous cabbage planter passage wherein he defends his digressive and and nonlinear style of writing, Tristram explains his "most religious" way of beginning a book: "I begin with writing the first sentence—and trusting to Almighty God for the second" (*TS* 8.2.656). Tristram compares himself to a faithful scribe that duly records divine inspirations, yet this image takes an interesting turn when he admits that he may have "intercept[ed] many a thought which heaven intended for another man" (*TS*

8.2.657). Inspirations are like letters: the moment a message is sent out from above, it becomes temporarily untethered and ownerless, until it reaches its intended recipient. The idea of interception raises all kinds of important questions about Tristram's authorship. If it is intercepted by someone like Tristram in the middle of the transmission, does the act constitute borrowing or theft? If an author cannot but sit and wait for divine inspiration, and has no idea when and what heaven will send from above, then he or she wouldn't know if someone like Tristram intercepts the message and put it into his own work. If inspiration is a gift, and the intended recipient has no knowledge of the gift, who has the right to or ownership of the gift during transmission? Jonathan Lamb reads Tristram's scribal metaphor as an explication of intertextuality, of the borrowings Tristram freely makes: "he outlines a potential community of ideas which is achieved whenever his interceptions are made, as they often are, at the level of libraries rather than the middle air" ("Sterne's System" 797). While his analysis sheds light on the secular community of authors and books, Lamb does not fully consider the religious context within which Tristram situates the metaphor—"I'm sure it is the most religious"—which both connects it to borrowing and undermines its sincerity. Despite Tristram's braggadocio, the scribe metaphor hides the ubiquitous practice of borrowings in sermons and misleadingly praises an inspirational model of writing that Sterne denounces for its over-reliance on enthusiasm.

As a novelist, Sterne depicts sermon borrowings first in "A Fragment in the Manner Rabelais" (1759), where Longinus Rabelaicus claims that a good sermon should be like "a thorough-stitch'd system of KERUKOPAEDIA," where quotations or borrowed thoughts are woven into one's own sermon like a piece of fabric (9:165).

Rabelaicus then suggests that all published sermons be compiled into one large volume to be "put into the Hands of every Licenced Preacher in Great Britain & Ireland just before He began to compose" (9:166). Practicing Rabeliaicus's method, Homenas, who has to preach next Sunday, borrows "Five whole pages, nine round Paragraphs, and a Dozen and a half of good Thoughts" from the Anglican clergyman Samuel Clarke and claims that his borrowings are "fair and square" because he is merely doing what any person would "lawfully call in for Help" in "any other human Emergency" (9:166). In *Tristram*, parson Yorick has the habit of writing down on the first page of every sermon he composes "the time, the place, and the occasion of its being preached: to this, he was ever wont to add some short comment or stricture upon the sermon itself" (*TS* 6.11.513–14). On one of his sermons, Yorick writes that "*[f]or this sermon I shall be hanged,—for I have stolen the greatest part of it. Doctor* Paidagunes *found me out. Set a thief to catch a thief*" (*TS* 6.11.514). Yorick does not elaborate on the contents of his sermon or of Dr. Paidagunes's finding, but his casual admission to theft and reference to Paidagunes as a thief suggest how prevalent stealing is among sermon-writers.

As a pastor and sermon-writer himself, Sterne also makes frequent borrowings in his sermons. In the preface to his first collection of sermons, *The Sermons of Mr. Yorick* (1760), Sterne admits that he has taken great liberty when it comes to identifying the sources of his quotations: "there are some other passages, where I suspect I may have taken the same liberty,—but 'tis only suspicion, for I do not remember it is so, otherwise I should have restored them to their proper owners" (*Sermons*, 4:2). In his biography of Sterne, Ian Ross comments that Sterne's sermons "show notable dependence on the published work of other preachers, that in some cases has been considered as tantamount

to plagiarism" (241). However, most scholars have excused Sterne's alleged plagiarism in his sermons by pointing out that borrowing was an accepted convention in eighteenth-century sermon-writing. In *Spectator* 106, for example, Sir Roger de Coverley tells Joseph Addison that he gave his chaplain "a Present of all the good Sermons which have been printed in *English*, and only begged of him that every *Sunday* he would pronounce one of them in the Pulpit. Accordingly, he has digested them into such a Series, that they follow one another naturally, and make a continued System of practical Divinity" (McDonald 279–80). In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Anglican clergymen routinely borrowed from published sermons because they sought not to develop progressive ideas but to reaffirm what was conventional, therefore safe, so as not to jeopardize their tenures (Gow 124).

Tristram's scribe metaphor presents writing as a product of divine inspiration, yet its sincerity is dubious when we consider Sterne's criticism of inspiration in his sermon "Humility," where he attacks those who compose sermons by relying not on published sermons but on inspiration, and compares these writers to

> the most illiterate mechanicks, who as a witty divine said of them, were much fitter to *make* a pulpit, than get into one,—were yet able so to frame their nonsense to the nonsense of the times, as to beget an opinion in their followers, not only that they pray'd and preach'd by inspiration, by that the most common actions of their lives were set about in the Spirit of the LORD. (*Sermons* 4:242)

Without erudition and established scholarship to support their sermons, these preachers, Sterne argues, are like illiterate laborers that should attend, rather than compose,

sermons.[6] Good sermons should, as Sterne does in his own, rely on borrowings from published ones. One of the consequences of frequent borrowings is that the styles of sermons composed by different clergymen became similar to one another, and Sterne's sermons were no exception. As New observes, "Sterne's voice coincides with the Anglican discourse as it developed in the hands of [John Tillotson, Clarke, John Wilkins, William Wollaston, Edward Stillingfleet, John Sharp] at the end of the seventeenth century and is part of the eighteenth-century chorus that imitated and emulated that discourse" (5:xiv).[7] Tristram's fallacious inspirational approach to writing is similar to how Sterne presents himself as a spontaneous writer to the world: "to me inconsiderate Soul that I am, who never yet knew what it was to speak or write one premeditated word," and who only writes with "that careless irregularity of a good and an easy heart" (*Letters*, 7:160). In his annotation to this passage, New refers the reader to Sterne's letter to David Garrick (January 27, 1760), where Sterne describes his first two volumes of *Tristram* as "hot as it came from my Brain, without one Correction" (*Letters*, 7:112). As Lewis Perry Curtis notes in his edition of Sterne's letters, Sterne's claim of spontaneity is "a Shandean invention" that conceals the careful revisions the novelist undertook (87). Ultimately, the scribe metaphor is a red herring that distracts us from recognizing the importance of borrowing in Sterne's fictional and sermon writings.

[6] Sterne's disapproval of inspiration is in line with his attack on "the mistaken enthusiast" in "On Enthusiasm" (*Sermons* 4:365). For a historical and linguistic overview of enthusiasm, see Susie I. Tucker, *Enthusiasm: A Study in Semantic Change* (Cambridge UP, 1972). For how Romanticism defined itself against the dangers of enthusiasm, see Jon Mee, *Romanticism, Enthusiasm, and Regulation: Poetics and the Policing of Culture in the Romantic Period* (Oxford UP, 2003).

[7] For a comprehensive examination of the sources for Sterne's sermons, see Lansing Van Der Heyden Hammond, *Laurence Sterne's Sermons of Mr. Yorick* (Yale UP, 1948).

The Picking-Up Metaphor

On the subject of noses, Walter is of the strong opinion that their lengths are connected to family fortunes: long noses lead to prominence, and short noses to obscurity. Walter's opinion is not original but borrowed from his family, where "[f]or three generations at least, this *tenet* in favour of long noses had gradually taken root" (*TS* 3.33.261). The tenet started with Tristram's great grandfather, who had to pay his wife a jointure of three hundred pounds a year because he had "little or no nose" (*TS* 3.31.257). In Walter's hands, the tenet is developed to explain the fall of the Shandy family, which "felt the turn of the wheel, and had never recovered the blow of my [Tristram's] great grandfather's nose" (*TS* 3.31.261). After recounting the history of his father's opinion on noses, Tristram uses a metaphor to explain how Walter forms opinions: "He pick'd up an opinion, Sir, as a man in a state of nature picks up an apple.—It becomes his own" (*TS* 3.34.262–63). This picking-up metaphor is immediately followed by an staged philosophical debate between Didius and Tribonius, lawyers of ancient Rome, where the former begins by asking, "Pray, Mr. *Shandy*, what patent has he to shew for it? and how did it begin to be his? was it, when he set his heart upon it? or when he gather'd it? or when he chew'd it? or when he roasted it? or when he peel'd? or when he brought it home? or when he digested?——or when he——?" (*TS* 3.34.263). Both the picking-up metaphor and Didius's questions are borrowed from John Locke's the *Second Treatise of Government*, where the Locke defines property by labor:

> Though the earth, and all inferior creatures, be common to all men, yet every man has a *property* in his own *person*: this no body has any right to but himself. The *labour* of his body, and the *work* of his hands, we may say, are properly his. Whatsoever then he removes out of the state that nature hath provided, and left it in, he hath mixed his *labour* with, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his *property*. (19)

As examples of his labor theory of property, Locke uses apples: "He that is nourished by the acorns he picked up under an oak, or the apples he gathered from the trees in the wood, has certainly appropriated them to himself. No body can deny but the nourishment is his" (*Second Treatise* 19). Having discussed man's appropriation of acorns and apples, Locke asks a series of rhetorical questions: "I ask then, when did they begin to be his? when he digested? or when he eat? or when he boiled? or when he brought them home? or when he picked them up? and it is plain, if the first gathering made them not his, nothing else could" (*Second Treatise* 19). The actions enumerated in Darius's questions are basically identical to Locke's, but the order in which they are presented is reversed. While Locke emphasizes the importance of gathering by putting it at the end of his questions, Tristram begins with gathering and builds the crescendo to digesting. More importantly, Tristram adds a new action—cooking—to the questions. While Locke does mention boiling in his questions, boiling is one of the simplest ways to cook food without adding any condiments or ingredients. By replacing boiling with cooking, Tristram makes metaphorical room to imagine more complex ways of engaging with opinions.

Tristram's addition of cooking is crucial to the picking-up metaphor, for it introduces intellectual labor, a type of labor not covered by Locke in the *Second*

Treatise.[8] Tribonius's answer to Didius further develops the significance of intellectual labor in the picking-up metaphor:

> the sweat of a man's brows, and the exsudations of a man's brains, are as much a man's own property, as the breeches upon his backside;——which said exsudations, &c. being dropp'd upon the said apple by the labour of finding it, and picking it up; and being moreover indissolubly wafted, and as indissolubly annex'd by the picker up, to the thing pick'd up, carried home, roasted, peel'd, eaten, digested, and so on;——'tis evident that the gatherer of the apple, in so doing, has mix'd something which was his own, with the apple which was not his own, by which means he has acquired a property. (*TS* 3.34.263–64)

The Lockean type of physical labor ("the sweat of a man's brows") is distinguished from intellectual labor ("the exsudations of a man's brains"). Together, they turn an apple/opinion to the indissoluble property of the person who exerts both physical and intellectual labor. After this staged debate, Tristram concludes that Walter has indisputable ownership of his opinions, for "they had cost him moreover as much labour in cooking and digesting as in the case above, so that they might well and truely be said to be his own goods and chattles" (*TS* 3.34.264). Walter's intellectual labor does not stop with claiming the opinion he borrowed from the Shandean tenet as his own. He, as Tristram describes, "would intrench and fortify them [opinions] round with as many circumvallations and breastworks, as my uncle *Toby* would a citadel" (*TS* 3.34.264). To

[8] While Locke does not directly address intellectual property in his discussions of labor, value, and property, many modern scholars have been endeavoring to develop or refute a Lockean theory of intellectual property. In "Justifying Intellectual Property," one of the earliest and most influential discussion on the topic, Edwin C. Hettinger famously rejects a Lockean theorization of intellectual property on the grounds that intellectual labor is drastically different from physical labor. For a review of the debates, see Adam Mossoff, "Saving Locke from Marx: The Labor Theory of Value in Intellectual Property Theory." *Social Philosophy and Policy*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2012, pp. 283–317.

defend his opinion on noses, Walter "collected every book and treatise which had been systematically wrote upon noses" (*TS* 3.34.265). Tristram's picking-up metaphor reveals that borrowing is not a lazy act of appropriating the product of others' labor or of shirking from investing one's own labor into producing new, original thoughts. Instead, borrowing involves expending labor in the form of "cooking and digesting." Consequently, borrowing is no longer a mere appropriation of other's labor, but a reinvigoration and compounding of labor on labor.[9] The picking-up metaphor unpacks the complex ways in which borrowing operates in *Tristram*. Both its vehicle and tenor are borrowed: Walter borrows the opinion from his family, and Tristram borrows the picking-up imagery from Locke.

While the picking-up metaphor illustrates the workings of borrowing on at least two levels, Tristram's insistence on the origin of Walter's opinion and his addition of excretion to the metaphor expose the danger of solipsism in a Lockean theorization of opinion forming. As Keenleyside observes, the picking-up metaphor is founded on "Walter's Lockean notion that an opinion can be his in the same way as an apple, that consciousness—and so persons—are composed of simple ideas that are picked up and put together like bits of matter" (119). This erroneous conflation between the material and the immaterial is one of the fundamental problems in Locke's labor theory of property, and Sterne uses it to debunk Walter's Lockeanism.[10] However, Keenleyside's discussion still

[9] When Lamb analyzes Sterne's use of commonplace proverbs that have lost their vibrancy after long use, he draws a similar conclusion about Sterne's technique: "Whatever truth has been lost from the proverb by timeless repetition is renewed by an active or dramatic imitation which makes words once more conversant about things" ("Sterne's System" 805).

[10] Keenleyside argues that in *The Second Treatise*, Locke's theory of property, constructed on identification of appropriation with eating, "effectively transforms the person from a living creature into a collection of goods, a mechanical assortment of the things he picks up. . . . Locke elides the distinction between 'his' and

centers on one person's relationship with objects and ideas without considering the roles of other persons. Opinions do not grow on trees like apples. They are not the Lockean ideas, which originate from either sensation or reflection. Walter's borrowed opinions are not actual objects that "*convey into the Mind,* several distinct *Perceptions* of things" such as color and texture, nor are they the product of "the *Perception of the Operations of our own Minds* within us, as it is employ'd about the *Ideas* it has got" (Locke, *Essay* 105). As Tristram emphatically reminds us, his father borrowed the opinion from the family:

> the whimsicality of my father's brain was far from having the whole honour of this, as it had of almost all his other strange notions.—For in a great measure he might be said to have suck'd this in, with his mother's milk. He did his part however.——If education planted the mistake, (in case it was one) my father watered it, and ripened it to perfection. (*TS* 3.33.261)

Erasing the prehistory of the Shandean tenet of noses, the picking-up metaphor presents a solipsistic world where only opinions, but not the persons who authored said opinions, exist. In other words, the community of authors from whom a person (e.g. Walter) borrows opinions is excluded from the picking-up metaphor.[11]

'him,' possession and person. Or, he refashions aspects of persons *as* possessions: thoughts and actions can be one's property in the same way as an apple in a basket, or in one's belly" (120).

[11] Sterne's implicit criticism of Locke's exclusion of community is indicative of his larger project with the philosopher. In his seminal study of Sterne's relationship with Locke, *Tristram Shandy's World: Sterne's Philosophical Rhetoric*, John Traugott argues that Sterne shares Locke's skepticism about communication but overcomes Locke's pessimism by developing interpersonal bonds through rhetoric: "Whereas Locke would resolutely analyze all ideas and exactly determine the significations of words in order to reconcile necessarily isolated minds . . . Sterne's purpose is to demonstrate and describe the constant frustration of such analysis, the impossibility of determining meaning apart from a context of human situations" (xv). For "a comprehensive account of the establishment, development, decline, and recent re-emergence of an interpretatively powerful idea: that Laurence Sterne was profoundly influenced by the philosophical empiricism of John Locke," see Darrell Jones, "Locke and Sterne: The History of a Critical Hobby-Horse," *Shandean: An Annual Devoted to Laurence Sterne and His Works* 27 (2016): 83–111.

As if predicting how the borrower will be borrowed, Tristram connects the picking-up metaphor scatologically with his own writing. Tristram ends his imitation of Locke's rhetorical questions in the picking-up metaphor with "——or when he——?". The first dash indicates a pause, a hesitation due to the indecency of his last question about excretion, the biological end product of the human digestive system. As Keenleyside observes, the final dash challenges the premise of the picking-up metaphor: "Eating is unlike 'picking up' because not everything that one eats becomes either his or him; digestion is always accompanied by excretion, incorporation by loss" (121). The proximity between digestion and excretion is developed more fully and dramatically in Tristram's papilliotes story. During his stay in Lyon, Tristram is sent into a panic because he lost his notes, "the best remarks . . . that ever were made—the wisest—the wittiest" (*TS* 7.36.639). He recalls that he left the remarks in his chaise, which he has sold to the chaise-vamper shortly before. He arrives and waits at the chaise-vamper's house for the merchant's return from May-poling, but instead he finds the merchant's mistress rushing home to use the toilet. As she removes the papilliotes, the small triangular pieces of paper that keep curls of hair in place, from her hair and throw them to the ground, Tristram recognizes the pieces to be his remarks and cries, "you have got all my remarks upon your head, Madam!" (*TS* 7.38.641). Like Walter's opinions-cum-apples, the papilliotes are caught between life (May-poling) and excretion, only the association with writing is much stronger. Agonized by the twisted remarks, Tristram bursts out: "ay! by my faith; and when they are published, quoth I,——" (*TS* 7.38.641). After a pause, he acquiesces and calmly states: "They will be worse twisted still" (*TS* 7.38.641). It is as if Tristram foresees and accepts the inevitable fate of his writing. The addition and coexistence of

cooking and excretion in the picking-up metaphor represent Sterne's critique of Locke's labor theory of property: intellectual labor and an authorial community are both indispensable to how borrowings facilitate opinion forming. To conceptualize how borrowings and opinions operate in an authorial community, Sterne turns to the settlement metaphor.

The Settlement Metaphor

In addition to noses, Walter also has a strong opinion on names, as he believes that "good or bad names . . . irresistibly impress'd upon our characters and conduct" (*TS* 1.19.58). Tristram describes again how Walter developed his opinion:

> he had a thousand little sceptical notions of the comick kind to defend.—most of which notions, I verily believe, at first enter'd upon the footing of mere whims, and of a *vive la Bagatelle*; and as such he would make merry with them for half an hour or so, and having sharpen'd his wit upon 'em, dismiss them till another day.
>
> I mention his, not only as matter of hypothesis or conjecture upon the progress and establishment of my father's many odd opinions,—but as a warning to the learned reader against the indiscreet reception of such guest, who, after a free and undisturbed entrance, for some years, into our brains,—at length claim a kind of settlement there.——working sometimes like yeast;—but more generally after the manner of the gentle passion, beginning in jest,—but ending in downright earnest. (*TS* 1.19.61)

Like the picking-up metaphor, Tristram's settlement metaphor describes how Walter forms his idiosyncratic opinions, but here opinions are compared to guests instead of apples. Personified as guests, opinions are untethered from their original authors and roam freely before they enter Walter's brain and become his opinions. However, we cannot tell Walter's exact stance toward his guests. Is he a hospitable or indifferent host? Does he encourage and respect his idea-guests, or does he merely tolerate their presence? We cannot pin down Walter's stance, nor can we fully comprehend the metaphor, because Tristram is vague about what he means by settlement. The only other settlement mentioned in the novel is Tristram's mother's marriage settlement with Walter, according to which Walter must supply her with 120 pounds for childbirth and have the child delivered in London. It is due to this marriage settlement that Tristram "was doom'd, by marriage articles, to have my nose squeez'd as flat to my face, as if the destinies had actually spun me without one" (*TS* 1.15.46). Marriage settlements were a common legal document in the eighteenth century, especially among the landed aristocrats, to stipulate how properties should be transferred upon the death of a spouse. Nevertheless, Tristram is not referring to marriage settlements in his metaphor because a marriage of husband and wife is by no means founded on one party's free and undisturbed entrance upon the other. What is clear about this metaphor is that Tristram imagines the brain as some kind of space—house, estate, town, country—that people can enter and settle in. Since settlement was commonly used in eighteenth-century discourses about land, I argue that in Tristram's metaphor settlement should be understood as "[l]egal residence or establishment in a particular parish, entitling a person to relief from the poor rates; the

right to relief acquired by such residence" ("Settlement").[12] Sterne's tenure as a vicar in Yorkshire would have made him familiar with the workings of his parish and the lives of his parishioners. Furthermore, the Christian doctrine of charity, a topic he enthusiastically preached on, was historically connected to poor relief.[13] Read in the context of poor relief, the settlement metaphor uses the parish as a trope to situate borrowing and opinion in a authorial community founded on sociability where authors freely borrow from one another.

As an institutional program of social welfare, poor relief originated from the English Old Poor Law that had its roots in the medieval period. After the Black Death (1348–50) wiped out at least a quarter of England's population, labor was in short supply, and wages rose astronomically. A series of statutes were passed in late-fourteenth century to discipline beggars and vagrants and to put every able-bodied man to work. Tudor monarchs continued to legislate ways to discipline the poor. In 1494, the Vagabonds and Beggars Act was passed, imposing harsher punishments for those who could but would not work. While beggars and vagrants were subjected to ever stricter laws, English monarchs also sought ways to relieve the impotent: the disabled, the elderly, those who would but could not work. After Henry VIII disbanded monasteries, priories, convents, and friaries, religious institutions were previously responsible for giving alms to the poor, in the mid-sixteenth century, English monarchs had to assume the responsibility of poor

[12] When used to mean "[t]he act of settling as colonists or new-comers; the act of peopling or colonizing a new country, or of planting a colony" ("Settlement"), settlement appeared in many publications about Britain's colonial project in North America. Colonization often targeted at ownerless virgin land, or in cases where the land had already been inhabited by indigenous people, the colonists' relationship with the locals was rarely the kind of peaceful settlement Tristram's metaphor implies. As a result, colonization is not the appropriate context to understand the settlement metaphor in.

[13] See his sermon "The case of Elijah and the widow of Zerephath considered," *Sermons* 4:40–56.

relief. During Elizabeth's reign, the Old Poor Law began to be codified, first with the 1597 Act for the Relief of the Poor and then with the Poor Relief Act of 1601. The most important step for managing and implementing poor relief is the practice of settlement, a legal means to establish and prove one's residence in a particular parish. Without settlement, one cannot legally apply for poor relief. In 1662, the Poor Relief Act, also known as the Settlement Act, laid down the principles of settlement. The act stipulates that any newcomer to a parish that is "likely to be chargeable" can acquire settlement if he has lived in the parish unchallenged for forty days, or if he rents a property worth ten pounds a year. Once settlement has been established, the individual can file his application for relief to the overseers, who are elected from within the parish among the parishioners who pay poor rate, a local tax based on the value of the property one lives on to fund poor relief. Relief comes as direct payments (e.g. pensions and doles) or as wages for being employed in workhouses. In the eighteenth century, poor relief had been developed not on a centralized system where the state is responsible for managing the relief, but on a local, parochial scale firmly rooted in the parishes. As a result, it "meant that far from being impersonal, a business run at a distance according to narrow principles, the relief of the poor was a matter for face-to-face management by overseers among their neighbors" (Slack 20).

Read in the context of poor relief, the settlement metaphor presents Walter not as a generic host whose stance we cannot determine, but as a charitable host who shelters and provides relief to poor, vagrant ideas. The parish, the geopolitical unit through which poor relief was administered, emerges in the settlement metaphor as a critical literary trope to organize the relationships among authors. As Scott McKenzie argues,

> The parish is the primary topos of managing the poor, but it might also be called the first topos (and topography) of the English novel. By the end of the eighteenth century the home has become the major topos—not to say telos—of the novel (as it is, for a time, of poverty management). Both parish and home subsist in fiction as conceptual frames and localizing principles that help organize the representation of place, space, and social affiliation. (619).[14]

In *Tristram*, the trope of the parish underscores the altruistic and social aspect of borrowing. It suggests that borrowing could be an equivalent of social welfare in intellectual property because it promotes the circulation of ideas and opinions. Individual authors become fixed territorial parishes among which ideas could freely migrate. No longer focused exclusively on the individual, the settlement metaphor promotes a sense of community, as all authors, like parishioners, are neighbors that collaborate to maintain and improve the wellbeing of ideas. The parish trope puts the settlement metaphor in the tradition of the estate metaphor. Using the parish as a spatial trope, Sterne presents the settlement metaphor to illustrate how borrowing and opinion help promote sociability in a parochial community of authors.

Originally formulated by Tristram to explain "the progress and establishment" of Walter's opinions, the settlement metaphor contains an embryonic form of Sterne's concept of authorship, one that is founded on parochial sociability. However, the specific way in which Tristram presents his metaphor—"as a warning to the learned reader"—

[14] McKenzie's argument is based on a reading of Henry Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*, which includes many references to and descriptions of poor relief and settlement. He mentions *Tristram* in the article, but only the general geography of the characters and events is referred to: "a 'world' marked out by the Shandy estate, Toby's bowling-green theater of warfare, Yorick's 'sallies about his parish,' and the midwife's 'small circle described upon the circle of the great world, of four *English* miles diameter, or thereabouts'" (619).

questions the legitimacy of such a reading. Opinions formed in Walter's way are, Tristram further modifies, like "yeast" or "the gentle passion": "beginning in jest,—but ending in downright earnest." Both similes have the connotations of intoxication. Yeast is the agent of alcoholic fermentation, and love is often portrayed as irrational. The earnest opinions thus formed become a unique type of madness, one that is distinctly Lockean. As Tristram speculates, "[Walter's] judgment, at length, became the dupe of his wit" (*TS* 1.19.61). Tristram's comment recalls the separation of wit and judgment famously made by Locke in the *Essay*:

> For *Wit* lying most in the assemblage of *Ideas*, and putting those together with quickness and variety, wherein can be found any resemblance or congruity, thereby to make up pleasant Pictures, agreeable Visions in the Fancy: *Judgment*, on the contrary, lies quite on the other side, in separating carefully, one from another, *Ideas*, wherein can be found the least difference, thereby to avoid being misled by Similitude, and by affinity to take one thing for another. (2.11.2)

Tristram suggests that Walter's overindulgence in wit and jest has clouded his judgment and impaired his ability to reason. Read in the context of the *Essay*, Tristram's warning against Walter's witty opinions echoes Locke's criticism of the association of ideas, which is defined as the "Connexion of *Ideas* wholly owing to Chance or Custom; *Ideas* that in themselves are not at all of kin, come to be so united in some Men's Minds, that 'tis very hard to separate them, they always keep in company, and the one no sooner at any time comes into the Understanding but is Associate appears with it" (2.33.5). Due to its unreasonableness, Locke calls the association of ideas a kind of madness, for "that opposition to Reason deserves that Name, and is really Madness" (2.33.4). Since Walter

often forms his opinions by freely borrowing and joining other people's ideas on a whim, the earnestness he develops with regard to the opinions could constitute the madness Locke equates with association of ideas.

Despite his warning about Walter's wit, Tristram does not present the settlement metaphor as an absolute interdiction against opinions, for he leaves the reader to judge for themselves. While he invokes Locke's separation of wit and judgment to assess his father's progress of opinion, Tristram mockingly rejects such separation in "The Author's Preface": "inasmuch as they [wit and judgment] are two operations differing from each other as wide as east is from west.—So, says *Locke*,—so are farting and hickuping, say I" (*TS* 3, 227). Furthermore, Tristram presents the judgment-becoming-the-dupe-of-wit comment as just one of the possible explanations: "Whether this was the case of the singularity of my father's notions,—or that his judgment, at length, became the dupe of his wit;—or how far, in many of his notions, he might, tho' odd, be absolutely right;——the reader, as he comes at them, shall decide" (*TS* 1.19.61). Without precluding the possibility that his father's opinions may be right, Tristram asks the reader to be the judge of Walter's opinions as they present themselves in the novel. By asking the reader to evaluate opinions, Tristram includes them in his parochial community, thereby expanding and complicating the notions of sociability and authorship.

The Heuristic of Opinion

In the novel, Tristram's sociability with the reader is modeled on friendship, the reciprocity of which promotes the reader's acquisition of knowledge. Tristram constantly speaks directly to the reader to give explanations, directions, and reminders. Tristram imagines his relationship to the reader as one between two people being "perfect strangers to each other" at first, and as the story progresses, "the slight acquaintance which is now beginning betwixt us, will grow into familiarity; and that, unless one of us is in fault, will terminate in friendship" (*TS* 1.6.9). Writing, in Tristram's mind, is the process through which the author and the reader converse with each other, because "Writing, when properly managed . . . is but a different name for conversation" (*TS* 2.11.125). This conversational and friendly model of author-reader relationship entails high expectations of reciprocity from the reader, the ideal of which is described by Sterne as "the true feeler": "a true feeler always brings half the entertainment along with him. His own ideas are only call'd forth by what he reads, and the vibrations within, so entirely correspond with those excited, 'tis like reading himself and not the book" (*Letters* 8:646).[15] At the core of the reciprocation between Sterne and his true feelers, knowledge is the most important subject and is what sustains the conversation. As Sterne explains in his sermon, "Conversation is a traffick; and if you enter into it, without some

[15] Before the true feeler was coined in Sterne's letter, the concept already appeared in *Tristram* in slightly less well-defined terms. Tristram believes that "[t]he truest respect which you can pay to the reader's understanding, is to halve this matter amicably, and leave him something to imagine, in his turn, as well as yourself" (*TS* 2.11.125). When listening to Trim's story of the king of Bohemia, Toby instructs him how to tell the story properly and explains that when listening to or reading a merry story, "a man should ever bring one half of the entertainment with him" (*TS* 8.19.682).

stock of knowledge . . . the trade drops at once" (*Sermons*, 20:194). In *Tristram*, Sterne insists that the reader should read his novel not for adventures but for knowledge. Instructing his lady reader to pause and reread a chapter, Tristram explains that the purpose of his instruction is

> to rebuke a vicious taste which has crept into thousands besides herself,—of reading straight forwards, more in quest of the adventures, than of the deep erudition and knowledge which a book of this cast, if read over as it should be, would infallibly impart with them.—The mind should be accustomed to make wise reflections, and draw curious conclusions as it goes along. (*TS* 1.20.65)

It is consequential that Tristram corrects what he calls "this self-same vile pruriency for fresh adventures in all things" (*TS* 1.20.66) and impart his reader with knowledge.

It may be said that Tristram's hobby-horse is authorship, for he revels in sharing his opinions on writing with the reader. In the beginning of the fifth volume, Tristram raises a series of questions about what constitutes true authorship:

> Tell me, ye learned, shall we for ever be adding so much to the *bulk*—so little to the *stock*?
>
> Shall we for ever make new books, as apothecaries make new mixtures, by pouring only out of one vessel into another?
>
> Are we for ever to be twisting, and untwisting the same rope? for ever in the same track—for ever at the same pace? (*TS* 5.1.408)

As many scholars have noted, Tristram's images of apothecaries and rope are borrowed from Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*.[16] Burton criticizes the practice of stealing form past authors: "As Apothecaries we make new mixtures everyday, poure out of one Vessell into another" (1:9); "we weave the same Web still, twist the same Rope againe and againe" (1:10). Lamb points out that Burton's passage was also plagiarized from other sources, so Tristram's passage adds an "extra element of fidelity" because "[t]he copy includes the defect of the original and finds a 'genuine' community with it in terms of defectiveness" (*Sterne's Fiction* 48). It is characteristically Shandean of Tristram to use borrowings, a form of recycling old mixtures and ropes, to encourage making qualitative contributions to "the stock" instead of adding mere quantities to "the bulk." As Sterne always associate stock with knowledge, this passage demonstrates how knowledge and borrowing are inextricable from authorship. In his dedication to Lord John Spencer, which directly precedes the chapter wherein the said stock and bulk are found, Sterne offers Volumes V and VI to his patron: "they are the best of my talents, with such bad health as I have, could produce:—had providence granted me a larger stock of either, they had been a much more proper present to your Lordship" (*TS* 5, dedication, 405). In Walter's view, an educator's responsibility to children is "to open their minds, and stock them early with ideas" (*TS* 5.42.484). He is confident that by studying the *Tristrapaedia*, Tristram will "increase his knowledge to such a prodigious stock" (*TS* 6.2.484). The association between stock and knowledge is seen when Tristram

[16] For discussions of Tristram's borrowing of Burton, see James A. Work ed., *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*, (Odyssey, 1940), 342n1; and H. J. Jackson, "Sterne, Burton, and Ferriar: Allusions to the *Anatomy of Melancholy* in Volumes V to IV of *Tristram Shandy*," *Philological Quarterly* 54, no. 2 (1975): 459.

describes his father as possessing "a great stock of knowledge" of love (*TS* 6.36.564).[17] As for "bulk," it often appears in the form of "the bulk of the world," meaning the general public of the world, particularly in vulnerable state prone to be deceived and fooled. For instance, in Sermon 6, regarding Pharisees' hypocrisy, Sterne maintains that they gained other people's trust because "the bulk of these [the people] are easily caught with appearances" (*Sermons* 4:58). He then uses the story of the Pharisees as an analogy for the Roman Church, whose obsession with appearances and ceremonies appeal to the people because "so strong a propensity is there in our nature to sense—and so unequal a match is the understanding of the bulk of mankind, for the impressions of outward things—that we see thousands who every day mistake the shadow for the substance, and was it fairly put to the trial would exchange the reality for the appearance" (*Sermons* 4:63–64).[18] This association between "bulk" and appearance that lacks substance explains why the unoriginal authors only add to the bulk but not to the stock: they write books that seem pleasing but are hollow, and they do not contribute to the production or dissemination of knowledge.

In *Tristram*, Sterne explores his authorial identity at the individual and communal levels. The scribe metaphor seems a straightforward representation of authorship, but it is more misleading than illuminating because of how it omits the conventional practice of borrowing in sermon writing. With the picking-up metaphor, Sterne explains how

[17] In *A Sentimental Journey*, Sterne develops the association between stock and knowledge by introducing the commercial implications of travel: "Knowledge and improvements are to be got by sailing and posting for that purpose; but whether useful knowledge and real improvements, is all a lottery—and even where the adventurer is successful, the acquired stock must be used with caution and sobriety to turn to any profit" (10).

[18] Sterne uses the expression in seven sermons (1, 6, 11, 26, 39, 43, 44). See *Sermons* 4:6, 58, 64, 103, 251, 253, 373, 404, 410, 414.

borrowings are acts of intellectual labor and contribute to the establishment and progress of his opinions. As the most popular form of the CULTIVATION metaphor, the picking-up metaphor could not keep pace with the expanding literary marketplace or capture how authorship was increasingly determined by one's relationships and networks. To correct the blind spots of the Lockean picking-up metaphor, Sterne uses the source domain of the parish to develop his settlement metaphor. He expands authorship beyond one individual's subject matter and writing process, and uses borrowings and opinions to foster an inclusive community characterized by sociability among all authors. Sterne's construction of authorship informed by poor relief is similar to Fielding's in *Tom Jones*, where Fielding admonishes his contemporary authors not to steal from one another because "[t]o steal from one another is indeed rightly criminal and indecent; for this may be strictly styled defrauding the poor" (540). After comparing borrowing to grafting, Pope urges reciprocity among authors: "A mutual commerce makes Poetry flourish; but then Poets like Merchants, shou'd repay with something of their own what they take from others; not like Pyrates, make prize of all they meet" (1:20). Walter's opinions, the forming of which the picking-up and settlement metaphors describe, may be singular and eccentric, but they repay the conscientious reader, for whom opinions are like a litmus test: they help identify and screen the true feelers who are capable of acquiring knowledge through opinions. The heuristic function of opinions can be illuminated by the eighteenth-century understanding of opinion and its relationship to knowledge. As Ephraim Chambers defines in *Cyclopaedia*, an opinion is "a probable belief; or a doubtful and uncertain judgment of the mind . . . Plato makes *opinion* a medium between knowledge and ignorance; clearer and more express than ignorance; yet more obscure

and unsatisfying than knowledge." By studying and weighing the opinions they read in *Tristram*, Sterne's readers learn not to become the dupe of wit but to exercise their judgment in the pursuit of knowledge. Thus, Sterne uses borrowings and opinions copiously in *Tristram* to encourage the association not of but *with* ideas: forming friendly relationships with ideas and using them as the heuristic tool for knowledge.

"She Sat Like a Cypher": Frances Burney's Rehearsals and Revisions of Authorship in *Evelina*, 1777–1779

In 1778, Frances Burney anonymously published her debut novel, *Evelina, or the History of a Young Lady's Entrance into the World* to critical and commercial acclaim. In her dedicatory poem "To — —," Burney addresses her father, Charles Burney, whom she calls "author of my being!—far more dear / To me than light, than nourishment, or rest" (*E* 3). Having extolled her father's virtues and his education of her, Burney admits her weak powers and resorts to anonymity to protect her father's name/fame:

> But since my niggard stars that gift refuse,
> Concealment is the only boon I claim;
> Obscure be still the unsuccessful Muse,
> Who cannot raise, but would not sink, your fame.

By redacting her father's name from the title, Burney consciously draws attention to her anonymity while suggesting that her father is a man of high esteem whose identity must be protected.[1] In the preface, Burney adopts the persona of an editor and recontextualizes anonymity and obscurity in the public:

> *The following letters are presented to the public—for such, by novels writers, novel readers will be called,—with a very singular mixture of timidity and confidence, resulting from the peculiar situation of the editor; who, though*

[1] After the novel was published and her authorial identity was revealed to her father, Burney implored her father to protect her anonymity by employing the same language in the poem: "it has always been as much upon *your* account as my own, that I have so earnestly desired to continue *incog*; for *I*, as *myself*, am nobody; but as *your* spawn, I could easily make myself *known*, & have power to *disgrace*, though not to *credit* you" (*EJL* 3:41–42).

> *trembling for their success from a consciousness of their imperfections, yet fears not being involved in their disgrace, while happily wrapped up in a mantle of impenetrable obscurity.* (*E* 9)

Though anonymous, Burney the editor situates herself in "*the republic of letters*," a community of novel writers consisting only of men (i.e. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Samuel Johnson, Pierre Marivaux, Henry Fielding, Samuel Richardson, and Tobias Smollett) (*E* 9). In both the poem and the preface, Burney presents her anonymity ostensibly in a patrilineal line, paying her tribute to her biological and literary fathers.[2]

The heroine, Evelina, shares many of the same qualities with her author: Both are young and timid in public spaces; both are prolific writers of letters and journals; and both aspire to become somebody from their relative obscure status in society. Due to these parallels, many critics have identified Evelina with Burney. Amy J. Pawl, for example, stakes her argument about Evelina's and Burney's identities on their common desire for paternal recognition: "Evelina's quest for a name and Burney's quest for authority as a writer both depend upon paternal acknowledgment and the approval of a chosen audience" (284). As early as 1989, Julia Epstein observed and warned against this dangerous tendency to conflate Burney and Evelina:

> Burney critics have tended to equate the writer's diaries and journals, letters, novels, and plays as all equivalent transcripts of actual life. This tendency—a

[2] Anonymous publication was the norm rather than the exception in the 1770s and 1780s. James Raven estimates that over 80 per cent of all novels were published anonymously during these decades. "Historical Introduction: The Novel Comes of Age," in *The English Novel 1770–1829: A Bibliographical Survey of Prose Fiction Published in the British Isles*, ed. James Raven and Antonia Forster, vol. 1 (Oxford UP, 2000), 41. For a review of studies on anonymity and *Evelina*, and on the distinction between intention and motive, see Mark Vareschi, "Motive, Intention, Anonymity, and *Evelina*," *ELH* 82, no. 4 (2015): 1135–58; and Mark Vareschi, *Everywhere and Nowhere: Anonymity and Mediation in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (U of Minnesota P, 2018).

> tendency that has plagued male writers as well, but more often in the form of the intentional fallacy—has obscured the distinctions in every writer's work both between literature and life in general, and between the differing ways Burney's sensibility rendered experience in nonfictional prose and in imaginative literature. (27)[3]

Attuned to the distinctions between literature and life, critics have interpreted Burney's authorship by a more nuanced reading of *Evelina* vis-à-vis Burney's journals and letters. In the 1970s and 80s, many critics studied Burney from a sociopsychological perspective and read *Evelina* as a social commentary that acquiesces to or rebels against the patriarchal society.[4] Starting with Catherine Gallagher's *Nobody's Story: The Vanishing Acts of Women Writers in the Marketplace, 1670–1820* (1995), more and more critics have analyzed Burney's authorial projects in the context of professional authorship and the literary marketplace. Gallagher argues that Burney presents herself and Evelina as Nobodies, creating a fictionality that redefines the novels: "[e]ighteenth-century readers identified with the characters in novels because of the characters' fictiveness and not in spite of it" (xvii). Betty A. Schellenberg traces the development of Burney's authorship from *Evelina* to *Cecilia*, a "fascinating crux in her professional life by reading it in terms

[3] Nearly two decades after Epstein's admonition, some critics still felt the need to repeat this important message. Reviewing the scholarship on *Evelina*'s anonymity, Mark Vareschi observes that "there is the tendency to unify author with text and character and to draw an analogy between Burney's presumed motive for anonymity (timidity) and Evelina's first (timid) steps into London society" ("Motive, Intention, Anonymity, and *Evelina*" 1137).

[4] For how Burney's novels provided her a venue to express her frustrations with societal constraints without challenging the status quo, see Patricia Meyer Spacks, *Imagining a Self: Autobiography and Novel in Eighteenth-Century England* (Harvard UP, 1976), 176–81; and Lillian D. Bloom and Edward A. Bloom and Bloom, "Fanny Burney's Novels: The Retreat from Wonder," *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 12, no. 3 (1979): 215–35. For how Burney criticizes patriarchy, see Kristina Straub, *Divided Fictions: Fanny Burney and Feminine Strategy* (UP of Kentucky, 1987); Margaret Anne Doody, *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works* (Rutgers UP, 1988); and Julia Epstein, *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing* (U of Wisconsin P, 1989).

of the *kind* of public identity Burney was fashioning for herself, an identity enabled by the structures of a developing print culture" ("From Propensity to Profession" 348).

For Burney critics, *Evelina*'s paratexts—the prefatory poem to Charles Burney, the preface, the dedication, and the frontispieces—are instrumental to interpreting Burney's authorial identity, especially regarding anonymity. Gallagher, for example, uses Burney's poem to her father to illustrate how "anonymity is explicitly marked as a daughter's condition," but she does not mention when or under what circumstances was the poem written (211). In her discussion of the poem, Doody alludes to some context of the poem ("Frances pencilled '4 in the Morn^{g}'; she claimed she wrote it in a fit of inspiration in the middle of the night"), but it is presented as a minor, rather than significant, detail (*Frances Burney* 37). Though critics have minded the differences between Burney the author and Evelina the character, they have not attended to the various publications dates of the text and paratexts of *Evelina* and have treated these discrete pieces as a coherent body of writing. The first two volumes of the novel were completed by late 1776; the third volume, the poem, the preface, and the dedication were written in 1777; and the frontispieces were added to the fourth edition in 1779. When we treat the different stages of writing and publishing *Evelina* as a coherent, homogeneous act, we create a version of Burney's authorial identity like a fully formed Athena and lose sight of Burney's sequential revisions of her authorship. To grasp Burney's emergent authorship developed around the publication of *Evelina,* I propose to study the cipher, a polysemous word whose main meanings in the eighteenth century include, according to Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language* (1755–56), code ("A secret or occult manner of writing, or the key to it"), monogram ("An intertexture of letters

engraved usually on boxes or plate"), and zero ("An arithmetical mark, which, standing for nothing itself, increases the value of the other figures"). In *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*, Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar argue that the cipher bears a special relationship to the paternity metaphor: "The necessary converse of the metaphor of literary paternity . . . was a belief in female literary sterility, a belief that caused literary women like Anne Finch to consider with deep anxiety the possibility that they might be 'Cyphers,' powerless intellectual eunuchs" (60). Burney introduced the cipher as Evelina's new attribute in the third volume, written in a critical moment where she was editing her manuscript for publication. Reading it as a metaphor for Burney's authorship, I argue that the cipher expands on and anticipates Burney's revisions of her authorship from 1777 to 1779. After rehearsing the possible conceptions and receptions of her authorship in the text and paratexts of the first edition, Burney reinvents her authorial self in the fourth-edition frontispiece to declare her artistic independence and celebrate female authorship. In Burney's hands, the cipher metaphor carves out a space in the BIRTHING metaphor over against the paternity metaphor by transposing women's patriarchal affinities to female relationships.

Volumes I and II, 1776: Face and Nobody

Throughout most of the novel, Evelina cannot but go by Miss Anville because she was illegitimated by her father, Sir John Belmont, who nullified his marriage with Caroline Evelyn and "infamously burnt the certificate of their marriage, and denied that

they had ever been united" (*E* 17). As Mr. Villars, Evelina's guardian and her mother's tutor, explains Evelina's right to her father's estate and the injustice she has suffered to Lady Howard:

> only child of a wealthy baronet, whose person she has never seen, whose character she has reason to abhor, and whose name she is forbidden to claim; entitled as she is to lawfully inherit his fortune and estate, is there any probability that he will *properly* own her? And while he continues to persevere in disavowing his marriage with Miss Evelyn, she shall never, at the expense of her mother's honour, receive a part of her right as the donation of his bounty. (*E* 20)

Indignant at Sir John's mistreatments of Caroline Evelyn and Evelina, Villars is determined to protect the daughter from the cruel realities of the world and keep her in the countryside where she could lead a private, virtuous life. To that end, Villars concealed Evelina's true name and gave her a new one: "I have always called her by the name of Anville, and reported in this neighbourhood that her father, my intimate friend, left her to my guardianship . . . [for] I am very desirous of guarding her from curiosity and impertinence, by concealing her name, family, and story" (*E* 21).[5] Evelina herself often feels conflicted about the name Anville because it raises questions about her family and the inglorious past she desperately wants to conceal from people. While she does not verbalize her anxieties about the name in public, she is not so restrained in her letters. In the first letter (VIII) written by her, Evelina expresses her anguish about her identity to

[5] As Miss Anville, Evelina is unknown to most people she interacts with in social gatherings. The name Anville is obscure; only once does anyone mention other Anvilles. When in Bristol Wells, Evelina is invited to dinner, along with Mrs. Selwyn, by Mrs. Beaumont, an aristocratic lady of high society and a relation of Orville's. Upon introduced to Evelina, Mrs. Beaumont asks "whether [she] was related to the Anvilles in the North?—Whether some of [Evelina's] name did not live in Lincolnshire?" (*E* 284).

her guardian through her signature at the end of the letter. She signs as "EVELINA— — —," and asks, "I cannot to *you* sign *Anville*, and what other name may I claim?" (*E* 26).[6] The dashes efface the last name from her signature, revealing her intense doubts and insecurities. She cannot sign Anville because both she and Villars know that her true name is Belmont, to which she has not established a claim. Evelina's dilemma is thus: The name she can own (Anville) does not represent who she is, but the name that does (Belmont) is not owned by her yet. In London, Evelina's identity and name come under closer scrutiny, thus causing more anxieties for the young heroine. In most of her letters to Villars from London, Evelina either signs as Evelina or includes no signature at all. In Letter XXIII, Evelina recounts "all the follies and imperfections" that happened in a trip to the Pantheon (*E* 116). At the end of the letter, Evelina signs her first name but appends a question mark to it ("EVELINA?"). In her first letter, her doubts about her identity prompts her to conceal the last name of her signature, but her first name is left intact. Yet in Letter XXIII, not even her first name, her core identity, is immune from the doubts and anxieties.

In public, Evelina's face is the manifestation and signifier of her identity. The topographic representations of her anxiety in private letters—dashes and question mark—materialize in the questions and rumors her face elicits from onlookers. Shortly after arriving at London, Evelina attends a private ball with the accompaniment of

[6] Samuel Choi observes that while the first seven letters between Villars and Lady Howard discuss Evelina's affairs, Evelina is referred to as "her" or "child," but never by her first name (263). For the symbolic meanings of the various ways in which Evelina signs as Evelina, with or without her surname (i.e. Anville, Belmont, and Orville), see Samuel Choi, "Signing Evelina: Female Self-Inscription in the Discourse of Letters," *Studies in the Novel* 31, no. 3 (1999): 259–78.

Mrs. Mirvan, her chaperon, and her best friend Maria Mirvan. The ball is not only a microcosm of the marriage market into which Evelina is entering, but it also introduces two motifs that are entwined with Evelina's pursuit of her name: face and nobody. As a newcomer in town, Evelina's beautiful face is the subject of inquiries. In a conversation between Lord Orville and Sir Clement Willoughby, which Maria overhears and relates to Evelina, Willoughby remarks on the heroine's beauty by calling her "the most beautiful creature I ever saw in my life," "an angel" that looks "all intelligence and expression" (*E* 36). Unimpressed by his interaction with Evelina, Orville describes her as "pretty modest-looking," "*silent*," and calls her "[a] poor weak girl" (*E* 37).[7] When Mr. Lovel joins Orville and Willoughby's conversation, he censures Evelina's "ill-breeding" for refusing his invitation to dance but then accepting Orville's, an impropriety that breaks "the rules of assemblies" (*E* 37, 35).[8] Lovel's next comment sums up Evelina's predicament and gives Evelina an epithet that will haunt her for the remainder of the novel: "for a person who is nobody, to give herself such airs,—I own I could not command my passions. For, my Lord, though I have made diligent enquiry—I cannot learn who she is" (*E* 37). Evelina's face is indeed beautiful. Once it appears in the ball, it enters what Captain Mirvan calls the game of "face-hunting," where people visit public spaces "for no manner of purpose but to stare at one another's pretty faces" (*E* 109).[9] By

[7] For the association between Evelina's silence and the animal, see Choi 422–23.
[8] As Epstein observes, "The dance—it's oppressive nonchoice of partners for women and the complacent 'disposal' of women by unselfish-consciously possessive men—serves as a metaphor for the female condition throughout *Evelina*. The fashionable and public places of dancing represent labyrinthine symbolic prisons for the unescorted and unidentified woman" (110).
[9] In *Evelina*, the face also provides entertainment on and off stage in theaters. After seeing David Garrick's performance as Ranger in Benjamin Hoadly's *The Suspicious Husband* (1747) at Drury Lane, Evelina marvels: "Such ease! such vivacity in his manner! such grace in his motions! such fire and meaning in his eyes!—I could hardly believe he had studied a written part, for every word seemed spoke from the impulse

seeing and being seen by people in public spaces, Londoners, especially those in high society, cement their social networks. As Mr. Lovel explains after a production of William Congreve's *Love for Love*, "one has much to do, in looking about, and finding out one's acquaintance, that, really, one has no time to mind the stage" (*E* 82). The sole purpose of going to public spaces, he maintains, is to "shew that one's alive" (*E* 82). The existence and stability of one's subjectivity rests on his or her reception in the social network, and the face is key to securing one's social and individual identity. Evelina's face, however attractive, is unidentifiable and illegible because she is a nobody.

The figure of nobody is important in both *Evelina* and Burney's early journals, providing critics with a model to conceptualize Burney's authorial identity. In her Juvenile Journal written between 1768 and 1778, Burney dedicates the first entry (March 27, 1768) to Nobody:

> To Nobody, then, will I write my Journal! since To Nobody can I be wholly unreserved—to Nobody can I reveal every thought, every wish of my Heart, with the most unlimited confidence, the most unremitting sincerity to the end of my Life! For what chance, what accident can end my connections with Nobody? No secret *can* I conceal from No—body, & to No—body can I be *ever* unreserved. Disagreement cannot stop our affection, Time itself has no power to end our friendship. The love, the esteem I entertain for Nobody, No-body's self has not power to destroy. From Nobody I have nothing to fear, the secrets sacred to

---

of the moment" (*E* 27). Off stage, the audience's faces also provide endless entertainment, as Evelina marvels at the fashionable ladies of London in the opera house: "every body was dressed in so high a style, that, if I had been less delighted with the performance, my eyes would have found me sufficient entertainment from looking at the ladies" (*E* 40). For Burney's fascination with the vivacity of Garrick's face and eyes, see *EJL* 1:151, 167; 2:40; 3:75. For how Garrick's face and acting style elucidate the de-essentialization of face as a stable signifier for identity, see Katherine Ding, "The Legible Face and the Illegible Body: Face-Work in Lichtenberg, Haywood, and Garrick," *ELH* 85, no. 3 (2018): 715–46.

> friendship, Nobody will not reveal when the affair is doubtful, Nobody will not look towards the side least favourable—. (*EJL* 1:2)

The fictional figure of Nobody gives Burney comfort and freedom to reveal her innermost thoughts, and it is also what she identifies with. Observing how both Burney and Evelina are timid and crave their fathers' attention, Lillian D. and Edward A. Bloom argue that "the Miss Nobody of the Diary or the silent observant Miss Fanny perched in a corner permitted the unconscious material of her mind to well forth in narrative symbols so that its harmful potential was minimized" (222). Instead of reading Nobody as a defense mechanism to relieve psychological stress, Susan C. Greenfield interprets Nobody as an empowering trope, through which Burney "erase[s] all externally determined marks of identity and become a blank slate upon which only she could write" ("Oh Dear Resemblance" 305). Similarly, Gallagher analyzes that the dash in Evelina's signature "erases 'Anville' and clears a space where 'Belmont' will eventually appear" (213).[10] Viewing Nobody in the larger context of the reading public, Gallagher argues that "Burney wrote for, about, and from the point of view of 'Nobody,' stressing the

[10] The dash also functions like a veil: it temporarily covers Evelina's true identity, which remains intact and awaits unveiling. She does not need to *invent* her identity; she simply needs to *reveal* it. Doody maintains that the name Evelina Anville could contain the secret meaning of "'Eve in a Veil'—Woman not known, Woman obscured. But her name is also 'Elle in Alive'—Woman persisting in living" (*Frances Burney* 40). She also notes that "a multitude of Burney's female characters have that hidden 'elle' or 'ella,' that supportive 'she' in their names: Camilla, Elgiva, Adela, Eleanora, Elinor, Eliza. The pseudonym of the last heroine, the central character on *The Wanderer*, is 'Ellis'—'Elle is.' That is what Burney is trying to convey in all her novels, that 'elle' is alive, that 'elle' *is*" (*Frances Burney* 40–41). For the trope of the veil in eighteenth-century novels, see Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, "The Character in the Veil: Imagery of the Surface in the Gothic Novel," *PMLA* 96, no. 2 (1981): 255–70. In her journals detailing her mastectomy in 1811, Burney describes how her surgeon Antoine Dubois places a veil-like handkerchief over her face during the surgery: "M. Dubois placed me upon the Mattress, & spread a cambric handkerchief upon my face. It was transparent, however, & I saw, through it, that the Bed stead was instantly surrounded by the 7 men & my nurse. I refused to be held; but when, Bright through the cambric, I saw the glitter of polished Steel—I closed my eyes" (*JL* 6:611).

questionable ontological and/or social status of her characters, her readers, and even herself, but in each case Nobody is transformed into one of her doubles" (214).

Volume III, the Poem, and the Preface, 1777: Monogram- and Code-Ciphers

As Gallagher's analysis shows, Nobody is instrumental to Burney's characterization of Evelina and to her conception of her own identity. Evelina is given the epithet by Mr. Lovel near the beginning of the novel, and she apparently takes it to heart. When she describes meeting Mr. Lovel again in Bristol in the third volume, she sarcastically writes: "Since I, as Mr. Lovel says, am *Nobody*, I seated myself quietly on a window, and not very near to any body" (*E* 288). Later when she attends a breakfast where she is neglected by everyone, she thus describes the scene to Villars: "Mrs. Beaumont, Lady Louisa, and Mrs. Selwyn, entered into their usual conversation.—Not so your Evelina: disregarded, silent, and melancholy, she sat like a cypher, whom to nobody belonging, by nobody was noticed" (*E* 340). This scene is reminiscent of the first ball Evelina attends in Volume I because of the slight she receives and the occurrence of Nobody. This third and last reference to Nobody introduces to the epithet a new dimension: the cipher. Semantically, cipher is close to nobody, as both can mean nonentity and obscurity.[11] Yet the syntax of Evelina's description, the way nobody is appended to cipher as explanation, seems to suggest some kind of reorienting of the

[11] Gallagher tangentially alludes to an epistemological proximity between cipher and nobody: "in eighteenth-century England Nobody was not a complete cipher" (206). But she does not explain how cipher is similar to or different from Nobody.

epithet. I believe the cipher holds the key to decipher Burney's authorship in the critical moments of the writing and publishing of *Evelina*. We do not know Burney's original thoughts on the writing of the first two volumes because she destroyed her journals of 1776, the year she wrote them. In later journals, Burney reflects that she wrote the novel for "entertainment" (*EJL* 2:288, 3:32), but such recollection may be more rhetoric than truth. What we do know is that Burney wrote the third volume, the poem, and the preface while she was preparing her manuscript for publication in 1777. When Burney contacted the bookseller Thomas Lowndes in December 1776 to pitch *Evelina*, she had already finished the first two volumes (*EJL* 2:213). She originally planned to publish the novel in two installments and desired "to have *felt the pulse* of the public" before commencing on subsequent volumes (*EJL* 2:217). Since she was the amanuensis for her father's *General History of Music*, Burney's handwriting was known to many London booksellers. To ensure her anonymity to Lowndes, Burney corresponded with the bookseller and transcribed the first two volumes in a feigned hand. By January 1777, Burney had finished the laborious task of transcribing:

> When, with infinite toil & labour, I had transcribed the 2d volume, [of *Evelina*] I sent it, by my Brother [CB Jr.] to Mr. Lowndes. The fear of Discovery, or of suspicion in the House, made the Copying extremely laborious to me; for, in the Day Time, I could only take odd moments, so that I was obliged to sit up the greatest part of many Nights, in order to get it ready. (*EJL* 2:231-32)

In March 1777, Burney began writing the third volume at Lowndes's request (*EJL* 2:216–17, 220–21). In the same month, Burney told her father that she had been working on publishing a novel and wrote the poem that night (*EJL* 2:233, 3:42). By September,

Burney had finished the third volume (*EJL* 2:285). Though Burney does not mention when she started or finished the preface in her journals, we can surmise it was written sometime in 1777. The labor of writing and editing in secret justifies Burney's refusal of Lowndes's initial bid of twenty guineas for copyright: "though it was originally written merely for amusement, I should not have taken the pains to Copy & Correct it for the Press, had I imagined that 10 Guineas a Volume would have been more than its worth" (*EJL* 2:288).[12] Written coterminously with the laborious copying and correcting for publication, the third volume, the poem, and the preface should be read together as sites where Burney rehearses her authorship and reinvents nobody as cipher. While the poem and the preface present anonymity in a patrilineal line, the third volume of the novel harbors two ciphers—Evelina's face and writing—that encrypt Burney's female authorship.

In the third volume of the novel, Evelina's reclaiming of her father's name seems to operate on the same deference to the patrilineal Burney the editor exhibits in the poem and the preface, but Evelina's resemblance to her mother, Caroline Evelyn, undermines her father's power. Though Evelina's beauty is often remarked upon, her resemblance to

[12] After negotiation, Burney eventually accepted Lowndes's offer. Regarding the process of writing and printing *Evelina*, Burney presents it as either innocent amusement or hard labor, depending on her audience and purpose. In her journal, Burney erases any trace of labor and emphasizes her naïveté: "I had written my little Book simply for my amusement; I printed it, by the means first of my Brother, Charles, next of my Cousin, Edward Burney, merely for a frolic, to see how a production of my own would figure in that Author like form: but as I had never read any thing I had written to any human being by my sisters, I had taken it for granted that They, only, could be partial enough to endure my compositions" (*EJL* 3:32). She recounts briefly and in vague terms how Charles and Edward Burney served as proxies to protect her anonymity. Burney again refers to the novel as "my frolic" at her introduction to the Streatham circle (*EJL* 3:71). However, calling the elaborate process of arranging the printing of the novel as "merely for a frolic" is disingenuous, as can be seen by how complicated the process is. Even the casual characterization of the writing process ("simply for my amusement") is an understatement, for it does not reflect how she found time to write a novel in secret.

her mother is barely mentioned in the first two volumes. Lady Howard, who knows both Caroline and Evelina, is impressed by the daughter's beauty: "Her face and person answer my most refined ideas of complete beauty" (*E* 22). She mentions the resemblance between the mother and the daughter, albeit not in physical terms: "She has the same gentleness in her manners, the same natural graces in her motions, that I formerly so much admired in her mother" (*E* 23). Even when she asserts that Evelina is "the lovely resemblance of her lovely mother," it is not entirely clear if she is referring to physical or temperamental resemblance (*E* 133). It is not until Volume III that Evelina's uncanny, physical resemblance to Caroline is fully developed as her strongest piece of support for her claim to the Belmont name. First, Mrs. Selwyn, Evelina's neighbor at Berry Hills, assures Evelina that Sir John will immediately recognize her as his daughter because "I have too strong a resemblance to my dear, though unknown mother, to allow of the least hesitation in my being owned, when once I am seen" (*E* 316). Before Evelina meets with Sir Belmont toward the end of the novel, Villars sends Evelina her late mother's letter and Mrs. Clinton as witnesses for her birth. He claims in his letter that her face is the strongest piece of evidence for her identity: "without any other certificate of your birth, that which you carry in your countenance, as it could not be effected by artifice, so it cannot admit of a doubt" (*E* 337). Developed only in the third volume, Evelina's maternal resemblance is a key to deciphering Burney's complicated rehearsals of authorship.

When Evelina finally meets her father, Belmont immediately recognizes Caroline in Evelina: "My God! does Caroline Evelyn still live!"; "I see, I see thou art her child! she lives—she breathes—she is present to my view!" (*E* 372). Despite Evelina's resemblance to her mother, Belmont in still not fully convinced that she is *his* daughter,

because he has been raising who he thinks is Caroline's daughter, Miss Belmont.[13] What convinces Belmont of Evelina's identity is Mrs. Clinton, who divines that Miss Belmont is really Miss Polly Green, the daughter of Evelina's first nurse, Dame Green (*E* 373).[14] Interestingly, Caroline's letter, which has been in Evelina's possession all along, is never presented to Belmont during this process.[15] Finally handed the letter after he has owned Evelina, Belmont asks, "why had I it not sooner?" (*E* 384).[16] In her letter, Caroline implores and threatens Belmont to own Evelina. Nearing the end of the letter, Caroline is seized by panic as she imagines that, should Evelina resemble her, should Belmont "in the features of this deserted innocent, trace the resemblance of the wretched Caroline,—should its face bear the marks of its birth, and revive in thy memory the image of its mother," Belmont would renounce Evelina (*E* 339).[17] Consequently, Caroline prays to the

---

[13] Belmont has "*always* observed that his daughter [Miss Green] bore no resemblance of either of her parents" (*E* 374), but he had never suspected that she is not his real daughter.

[14] Mrs. Clinton, Evelina's nurse and Mr. Villars's housekeeper, whom both Evelina and Villars praise as "worthy" (*E* 21, 220), plays a vital yet cryptic role in the novel. She is first mentioned in the beginning of the novel when Villars informs Lady Howard that Mrs. Clinton will attend Evelina to Howard Grove (*E* 21). However, Evelina never mentions her accompaniment in any of her letters. Mrs. Clinton is not heard from again until about two thirds into Volume II, when Villars expresses doubts about Mr. Macartney and Sir Clement Willoughby. He looks forward to Evelina's departure from London to Howard Grove, to which end he sends Mrs. Clinton to "accompany [Evelina] to Howard Grove" (*E* 219). Mrs. Clinton lurks on the periphery in the first two volumes, occasionally mentioned as Evelina's travel companion that escorts the heroine from one place to another. Even when she appears on center stage to redeem Evelina's name, she is never given the opportunity to speak for herself in direct dialogues. Instead, other characters (i.e. Evelina, Mrs. Selwyn) speak for her.

[15] Evelina may have been too overwhelmed and agitated to think about the letter in her first meeting with Belmont, but she could have entrusted it to Mrs. Selwyn to prove her identity before and after the meeting. In fact, Mrs. Selwyn seems to have no knowledge of the letter; otherwise, she would have utilized it to convince Belmont. Caroline's letter alone might very well have convinced Belmont of the veracity of Evelina's story. Mr. Macartney, Evelina's half-brother, is owned by Belmont because of his "unhappy mother's letter" (*E* 362).

[16] Evelina does not know the contents of the letter, for "it has never been unsealed" (*E* 384). But as readers, we already know its contents, because its entirety has already been printed as Letter XIII in the third volume. The reader's knowledge of the letter before any other character in the novel is reminiscent of situation of Pamela's will composed before giving birth to her first child in *Pamela II*. Aside from the writer of the letter, the reader is the only person that knows its contents the moment it appears in the novel.

[17] Carolina's imagining of Belmont's tracing Evelina's face for resemblance to herself evokes the connection between memory and space. While staying in London with her grandmother, Madame Duval,

infant Evelina: "look not like thy unfortunate mother,—lest the parent whom the hand of death may spare, shall be snatched form thee by the more cruel means of unnatural antipathy" (*E* 339). Instead of unnatural antipathy, Belmont is tormented by guilt and regret. The letter reminds him how unjustly he treated Caroline. It injures him like a physical assault: "Ten thousand daggers could not have wounded me like this letter" (*E* 385). Evelina's face, through its maternal resemblance, becomes an extension of the letter, creating a similar effect in Belmont: "thy countenance is a dagger to my heart!—just so, thy mother looked,—just so—" (*E* 386). The memory of Caroline, manifesting in the letter and Evelina's face, subjects Belmont nearly to despair and compels him to seek forgiveness from the mother through the daughter: "thou representative of my departed wife, speak to me in her name, and say that the remorse which tears my soul, tortures me not in vain!" (*E* 385). Mrs. Clinton's testimony may have persuaded Belmont that Evelina is his daughter, but it is Caroline's letter, combined with Evelina's face, that gives Belmont a cathartic moment that will enable him to love, not dread, Evelina in the future.

Evelina's face, which carries "the certainty . . . of [her] real birth" (*E* 374), is both visible and invisible, both transparent and opaque. Her matrilineal inheritance is never in doubt because of her resemblance to Caroline, but her patrilineal inheritance is precarious

---

and away from the Mirvans, Evelina asks Miss Mirvan in a letter if she ever revisits their time together in the city: "Tell me, my dear Maria, do you never re-trace in your memory the time we spent here when together? to mine, it recurs forever! And yet, I think I rather recollect a dream, or some visionary fancy, than a reality" (*E* 174). Evelina again retraces her time in London at the Hamstead ball, accompanied by the loathesome, vulgar Branghtons and Duval. She is repelled by the ball the people there, devoting her thoughts instead to "re-tracing the transactions of the two former balls" she attended with Maria (*E* 225). On both occasions, Evelina re-traces in her memory her happy adventures in London. By referring to Evelina's face as something that Belmont can trace and re-trace, Caroline is implicitly comparing her and Evelina's faces to a city like London.

because there is not a trace of Belmont's likeness in her face.[18] This duality of Evelina's face functions like a cipher in the sense of monogram. As Ephraim Chambers defines in his *Cyclopaedia,* ciphers are "a kind of enigmatic character, composed of several letters interwoven; which are ordinarily the initial letters of the persons names, for whom the *Cipher* is intended." As symbols of status, ciphers were often associated with aristocrats and the genre of romance in the early modern period.[19] In the eighteenth century, ciphers still symbolized status for those in, or aspiring to be in, high society. In his *Rambler* 192, for example, Samuel Johnson relates the story of a man who climbed up in rank and restored his family's name. He then "hung the arms of the family over his parlour-chimney; pointed at a chariot decorated only with a cypher; became of opinion that money could not make a gentleman" (240). As a cipher, Evelina's face interweaves her father's and mother's names: her maternal resemblance elevates the latter at the expense of the former. Though the narrative arc ostensibly leads to Evelina's reclaiming of her

[18] Throughout the novel, the only paternal resemblance mentioned around Evelina is Orville's to her surrogate father, Villars. When Evelina first describes Orville to Villars in a letter, she detects a resemblance between the two men: "I sometimes imagine, that, when his youth is flown, his vivacity abated, and his life is devoted to retirement, he will, perhaps, resemble him whom I most love and honour. His present sweetness, politeness, and diffidence, seem to promise in future the same benevolence, dignity, and goodness. But I must not expatiate upon this subject" (*E* 74). Toward the end of the novel, Captain Mirvan plays a prank on Lovel by telling him: "I met a person just now, so like you, I could have sworn he had been your twin-brother" (*E* 399). Lovel's twin-brother turns out to be a monkey, and it later wounds Lovel's ear. For how the resemblance between human and animal relates to Evelina and the theme of identity, see Susan C. Greenfield, "Monkeying Around in *Evelina*: Identity and Resemblance Again," *Eighteenth-Century Novel* 6–7 (2009): 409–28.

[19] See, for example, Edmund Spenser's *Fairy Queen*, where Britomart describes Artegall's armor as "round about yfretted all with gold, / In which there written was with cyphres old, / *Achilles armes, which Arthogall did win*" (3.2.25). Ciphers are such a staple in romances that Miguel de Cervantes has a humanist in his *Don Quixote* publish

> The book of Liveries, in which he had described seven hundred and three liveries, with their colours, mottos, and cyphers: 'From these, said he, your courtiers may extract and assume such devices as will suit their fancies, in times of festivity and rejoicing, without going about begging from any person whatever, or cudgelling their brains, as the saying is, in order to invent what will suit their several desires and dispositions. (548).

father's name, her face quietly but adamantly preserves and celebrates her matrilineal allegiance in public, as a cipher revealing its lineage only to those in the know.

Though dead, Caroline wields enormous power over Evelina's identity in the patriarchal society. She is, like Evelina, an author. Greenfield argues that "[t]hrough its insistence that Evelina is authored by her mother, who in turn is authored by Evelina, the novel demonstrates that the ability to delegate names and offer a legitimate narrative is a female generative power" ("Oh Dear Resemblance" 313). Caroline's authorship alludes to the prehistory of *Evelina*, a lost manuscript titled *The History of Caroline Evelyn*. Burney burned the novel, along with everything she had written, on her fifteenth birthday. Her sister Susanna, who alone witnessed the burning, wept "over the imaginary ashes of Caroline Evelyn, the mother of Evelina" ("Dedication" 8). Not only does *Evelina* alludes externally to another novel, it also points internally to a second novel consisting of letters exchanged between Evelina and Maria. In Volume II, the last five letters are addressed to Maria, but we do not see letters from the latter. We can surmise what Maria wrote only by Evelina's responses to her friend's accusations, charges, railleries, and complaints (*E* 256, 260, 262).[20] At the very end of the second volume, Evelina promises Maria that she would write "with as much constancy as if [she] had no other correspondent" (*E* 270). However, Volume III includes no letters from or to Maria. We can infer that Evelina keeps her promise because Maria, "who had no sooner heard the situation of [Evelina's] affairs" regarding the reconciliation between Evelina and

[20] As the editor, Burney chooses not to include any of Miss Mirvan's letters in Volume II, an approach drastically different from Samuel Richardson's, who painstakingly includes as many letters from all correspondents as possible in *Clarissa*, even at the risk of repetition.

Belmont, comes to visit Evelina in Clifton with Captain Mirvan. Regardless, no actual letters from or to Maria appear in the third volume, and we can only infer the existence of these letters through the oblique way she "heard" the situation of Evelina's affairs. The exclusion of these letter makes one wonder: Does Evelina relate the same incidents in the same light to Villars and Maria? What kind of advice does she get from Maria? The erasure of Evelina's letters to Maria in Volume III constitutes another cipher, one through which Burney contemplates the consequences of becoming an author in the reading public.

As her journey nears its end, Evelina retreats more and more frequently to her room to write letters. As Jennifer A. Wagner observes, "Particularly toward the end of the novel, as the heroine becomes more and more aware of her own private romantic feelings *as* such, 'my own room' is mentioned more and more frequently. Like Berry Hill, 'my own room' is also a place of retirement where society can be viewed (in letter) with a candid, critical eye or altogether ignored" (100). Evelina's frequent retreats to her room to write in private mirror the many clandestine hours she spent writing and editing her novel away from the eyes of her family. As Burney developed and experienced the ontological association between writing and the privacy of one's room in her work and her life, she would later rely on this rhetoric to defend herself after *Evelina*'s publication in 1778. In March, Burney visited Bell's circulating Library to inquire about her novel and experienced, for the first time, the shock of seeing *Evelina* in the public:

> I have an exceeding odd *sensation*, when I consider that it is in the power of *any* & *every* body to read what I so carefully hoarded even from my best Friends, till this last month or two,—& that a Work which was so lately Lodged, in all

> privacy, in my Bureau, may now be seen by every Butcher & Baker, Cobler & Tinker, throughout the 3 kingdoms, for the small tribute of 3 pence. (*EJL* 3:5)

Burney's association of the novel with the privacy provided by her room and bureau contrasts sharply with the literary market that she had now entered. Her embarrassment at the circulating library may be attributed to her inner struggles to reconcile between her aspiration for authorship and her fear of being indecorous. Her conflicted sense about authorship prompted her to reveal her secret to only a selected number of family and friends, from whom she asked vows of secrecy. When Hester Thrale, the hostess of the Streatham circle whose members included Samuel Johnson, learned about Burney's timidity toward fame, she explained to Burney that "if you *will* be an Author & a Wit,—you must take the Consequence!" (*EJL* 3:116). To convince Burney, she asked, "for *why* should you *write* a Book, *Print* a Book, & have every Body *Read & like* your Book,—& then sneak in a Corner & disown it!" (*EJL* 3:116). In her reply, Burney claimed that the novel was originally intended private entertainment and not for publication: "I had so little notion of being *discovered*, & was so well persuaded that the Book would never be *heard of*, that I really *thought* myself as safe, *& meant* to be as private, when the Book was at Mr. Lowndes', as when it was in my own Bureau" (*EJL* 3:116). Knowing the laborious process of publishing *Evelina*, we can reasonably suspect the sincerity of Burney's disregard for the public, but the association between writing and bureau is consistent with Evelina's writing in her room. While writing the third volume of her novel in 1777, Burney used her experience of secret writing and editing to develop plot and rehearse her apology for being a public author.

As the heroine's confidante, Maria functions primarily as Evelina's foil in the novel to help advance plot. As Pawl concludes, Maria "is essentially an invisible character, existing only as a faint reflection of Evelina," and this "guarantees that she will not compete with Evelina for anyone's attention—the reader's included" (288, 289). However, Maria's seeming invisibility should not hinder us from appreciating her discursive importance in the novel. The faint traces left by the lost Maria letters, the scattered words through which we conjecture the existence and content of said letters, exist as ciphers carrying coded messages. As Chambers explains, ciphers are "secret characters, disguised and varied; used for the writing of letters that contain secrets not to be understood by any but those between whom the *Cipher* is agreed on." Evelina's erased letters to Maria in the third volume can be interpreted as Burney's commentary on the epistolary novel, a genre in which the correct way of reading, or deciphering, letters is instrumental to the stability of meaning and identity. In Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa*, the heroine famously compares herself to a cipher: "I am but a cipher, to give him [Lovelace] significance, and myself pain" (567). In Terry Castle's reading, she argues that Clarissa's cipher metaphor holds the key to understanding the hermeneutics of epistolarity:

> Uncovering the crucial metaphor of reading, she [Clarissa] stumbles, half-consciously, on a precise symbol for her bondage. She has become a cipher to Lovelace, a sort of text—and he, her exegete. 'Clarissa Harlowe' is but a sign—the letter—from which, obscurely, he takes away significance. She herself receives nothing from this act of penetration—nothing, that is, except grief. She remains the subject of his interpretation, without pleasure or power as such: a hermeneutic casualty. (*Clarissa's Ciphers* 15–16)

Though Castle's glossing of cipher as code is incorrect in the context of Richardson's passage, her claim that epistolarity hinges on decoding is valid.[21] As ciphers, Evelina's letters to Maria contribute to reading and identity, yet their hermeneutic function is not based on a zero-sum relationship as Castle interprets *Clarissa*. Rather, the Maria letters inhibit interpretation by the voyeuristic reader because they serve to nurture female readership and friendship between Evelina and Maria. Critics have remarked on how Evelina's letters to Maria stand out stylistically from other letters in the novel. Epstein argues that they "mark tonal shifts in the narrative and serve as meditation all breaks from the newsy, fast-paced yet discursively bloodless letters Evelina sends to her guardian" (101). Wagner maintains that these letters create "a new 'private space' . . . a textual privacy of a journal" for Evelina (106). Burney's exclusion of Maria's letters from the novel gestures toward, but denies the reader of, another dimension to Evelina's writing that may be more intriguing than her letters to Villars. Epstein concludes that "there is a second novel here, over which *Evelina* rests like a palimpsest: the novel that Evelina's letters and conversations with a peer, another young woman, would comprise"

[21] For modern readers, cipher's meaning of code is probably the most familiar and the first that springs to mind. As Thomas O. Beebee points out, Castle interpret the word "according to the most common American meaning of 'code'" (50), but the context from which the quotation is found suggests that "There is in this passage no hint that Clarissa does not understand herself; her words simply express her isolation and the feelings of inferiority which this isolation causes her" (51). In fact, cipher-as-code appeared almost exclusively in literary texts about espionage in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries because ciphers were used between diplomats to communicate sensitive and confidential state information. In his *Letters Writ by a Turkish Spy*, an immensely popular fictional work about an Ottoman spy's reports on the French court of Louis XIV, Giovanni Paolo Marana describes how and for what purposes ciphers are used: "Depart then immediately for Italy, and observe the actions and motions of the wisest and most dissimulative court in the universe; discover not thy self to any body: Send me an account every week what thou canst discover; and in this manner thou wilt be useful to me, and avoid idleness. My Secretary will give thee a cypher" (1:114). Instead of comparing herself to a code, Clarissa, Beebee argues, is using cipher's meaning of "zero" to describe her relationship with Lovelace: "being held and exhibited at Lovelace's side raises his value in the eyes of others, exactly as a zero on the right increases the value of one to ten" (52). Cipher's meaning of zero will be discussed below.

(Epstein 102). Epstein's intriguing claim can be corroborated when we consider a relationship similar to Evelina and Maria's between Burney and Susanna. As Burney writes to her sister on March 15, 1777, "do you know I write to *you* every Evening, while the family play at Cards? The folks here often marvel at your ingratitude in sending me so few returns in kind" (15 Mar 1777; *EJL* 2:221). If Burney's supposed correspondence with Susanna gave rise to the third volume of *Evelina*, it is conceivable that Evelina's letters with Maria could make a second novel.

The Frontispiece, 1779: Zero-Cipher

Evelina was published on January 29, 1778. In March, Burney rapturously recounted the publication in her journal: "This Year was ushered in by a grand & most important Event,—for, at the latter end of January, the Literary World was favoured with the first publication of the ingenious, learned, & most profound Fanny Burney!—I doubt not but this memorable affair will, in future Times, mark the period whence chronologers will date the Zenith of the polite arts in this Island!" (*EJL* 3:1). In April, the *Monthly Review* called *Evelina* "one of the most sprightly, entertaining, and agreeable productions of this kind" (316). Overwhelmed by her success, Burney expressed her astonishment as well as disbelief in a letter to her father written on July 6: "I am so much astonished at this flow of success, that I sometimes think I have taken as long a Nap as the *Sleeping Princess in the Wood*, & that, when I wake from my reverie, I shall, like her, find all things just as they were before I was beguiled by such visions" (*EJL* 3:43). In August, Burney was introduced to the Streatham circle, where she received praises from famous

authors such as Samuel Johnson and Richard Sheridan. In September, the *Critical Review* praised the novel as one that "would have disgraced neither the head nor the heart of Richardson" (202). By the time the second edition of *Evelina* came out in October 1778, Burney had become one of the most famous authors in London.

In her letter to Samuel "Daddy" Crisp on 4 May 1779, Burney writes that "a 4th Edition is preparing, with Cuts, designed by Mortimer just before he Died, & executed by Hall & Bartolozzi" (*EJL* 3:264).[22] The fourth edition was published in November 1779, and three frontispieces were added to the three volumes respectively. Of the three, only the frontispiece to the first volume is not an illustration of an incident in the novel, which, Doody conjectures, "may have been France's choice" (*Frances Burney* 32). In the first frontispiece, a female figure leans against a tomb with the inscription of Belmont. Beneath the illustration are the first two lines from the dedicatory poem: "Oh author of my being!—far more dear / To me than light, than nourishment, or rest." Though the reader might assume the female to be Evelina because of the name on the tomb, she can also be identified as Burney, the author of the lines. The ambiguity of the female figure's identity results from her position in relation to the image (tomb) and to the text (poem). What the frontispiece highlights is the importance of positionality for Evelina's and Burney's identities: who they are is determined by how they relate to other people. If we revisit the cipher simile—Evelina sits "like a cypher, whom to nobody belonging, by nobody was noticed"—in the third volume with the hindsight of the entire publication

[22] Lars E. Troide and Stewart J. Cooke note that "The engravings, dated 24 Nov. 1779 in the published edition, were by John Hall, Francesco Bartolozzi . . . and 'Walker' (probably William Walker [1729–93]). The 4th edn., though with the imprint date 1779, was not actually published until Feb. 1780" (*EJL* 3:265n10).

history of *Evelina* from 1777 to 1779, we will begin to see how the simile encrypts Burney's model of authorship. First, the cipher is differentiated from nobody in the simile as the latter is presented as the former's attribute. Cipher may have semantic overlap with nobody, but the two are neither synonymous nor identical. Next, the second half of the simile underscores cipher's positional nature: how it belongs *to* and is noticed *by* nobody or somebody. The second half of the simile can best parsed by Evelina's face and writing, which, as I have argued, function as monogram- and code-ciphers. While Evelina struggles to belong to, or be owned by, her father, her essential belongingness is never in doubt because of her maternal resemblance. As a monogram, Evelina's face affirms female authorship, a matrilineage that connects women vertically and intergenerationally. Though she complains about being unnoticed at Mrs. Beaumont's breakfast table, Evelina is generally troubled by being hypervisible at social gatherings. Her letters with Maria, which are erased and unnoticed in the third volume, function as a code to cement female friendship horizontally and intragenerationally. The positionality of the monogram- and code-ciphers is developed covertly and separately in the third volume of *Evelina*. In the first frontispiece, this positionality is foregrounded, although in a coded way. To decode the frontispiece and Burney's authorship, we need to trace the cipher back to its oldest meaning: zero.

Etymologically, cipher was derived from *ṣifr*, the Arabic word for the arithmetical symbol "zero." The concept of zero did not exist in the European numerical system prior to the twelfth century. The Italian mathematician Fibonacci introduced the Arabic numerals to Europe in his *Liber Abaci* ("The Book of Calculation") published in 1202. Fibonacci translated *ṣifr* to *zephirus*, a Latin word associated with Zephyr, the Greek god

of the west wind. As an arithmetic symbol for zero, the cipher has no value of its own but increases or decreases value when used in conjunction with other numbers. As Chambers describes, the cipher "of it self implies a privation of value; but when disposed with other characters on the left thereof, in the common arithmetic, it serves to augment each of their values by ten; and in decimal arithmetic, to lessen the value of each figure ot the right thereof, in the same proportion." This doubleness of the cipher, as privation and augmentation of value, appeals to many writers for its ability to characterize both nonentity and signification. In his *Epistles*, Horace uses the nonentity meaning to describe the insignificance of men's lives: "We are but ciphers, born to consume earth's fruits" (I.ii.27). Francis Quarles's play on the cipher's double meaning in *Divine Fancies* (1632) is representative of the power of the trope. In the epigram "On a Cypher," Quarles first compares men to ciphers:

> *Cyphers* to *Cyphers* added, seeme to come
> (With those that know not *Art*) to a great *sum*:
> But such as skill in *Numeration*, know,
> That worlds of *Cyphers*, are but worlds of *show*:
> We stand those *Cyphers*, ere since *Adam's* fall;
> We are but *show*; we are no *summe* at all:
> Our bosome-pleasures, and delights, that doe
> Appeare so glorious, are but *Cyphers* too:
> High-prized *honour*; *Friends*; This *house*; The *tother*,
> Are but one *Cypher* added to another

Quarles believes that in the secular, post-lapsarian world, men are but substanceless shadows walking the earth if they do not have faith. To demonstrate how religion endows

meaning to people's lives, Quarles cleverly plays on the doubleness of the cipher as meaning augmentation. He appeals to the higher being:

> Lord, be my *Figure,* Then it shall be knowne
> That I am *Something*: *Nothing,* if alone:
> I care not in what *place,* in what *degree*;
> I doe not weigh how small my *Figure* be:
> But as I am, I have nor worth, nor *vigure*:
> I am thy *Cypher*; O, be thou my *Figure*

Quarles plays on the relationship between ciphers and figures, the latter being numbers one to nine, to illustrate how God alone endows the speaker with meaning, turning him from nothing to something.[23]

The cipher's dependence on other figures lends itself to characterizing women's marriage to men. Alluding to and resisting against this view on women's inherent nothingness, Mary Astell urges women to be educated and make contributions to their families and society in *A serious proposal to the ladies* (1694): "Neither God nor Nature have excluded them from being Ornaments to their Families and useful in their Generation; there is therefore no reason they should be content to be Cyphers in the World, useless at the best, and in a little time a burden and nuisance to all about them" (10). In his novels, Richardson uses the parallels between women and ciphers to describe his heroines. Toward the end of *Pamela*, Mr. B's newly wedded wife prays to God that she would be a good companion:

[23] In the anonymous manual *The complete letter-writer*, the author explains that numbers are expressed by "these ten characters, *viz*. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, which are called *figures*, and 0, which is a *cipher*" (261).

> Then shall I not stand a *single* mark of thy goodness to a poor creature, who in herself is of little account in the scale of beings, a mere cypher on the wrong side of a figure; but shall be placed on the right side; and though nothing worth in myself, shall give signification by my *place,* and multiply the blessings I owe to thy goodness, which has distinguished me by so fair a lot! (*P* 388)

Instead of seeing God as her figure, as Quarles does in "On a Cypher," Pamela reconfigures the relationship between cipher and figure in a marital context and underscores the importance of finding the right husband (being "placed on the right side"). In *Clarissa,* the heroine compares herself to "a cipher" because she gives Lovelace significance. As the patron of the epistolary novel in the eighteenth century, Richardson seeds the ontological connection between his heroines and ciphers, a connection Burney revises in her frontispiece.[24]

As she herself describes, Evelina is indeed a cipher, a zero, in the novel, but nowhere does she express the sentiment to add value to male figures (Belmont and Orville) by being put in the right place, as Richardson's Pamela and Clarissa do. As for

---

[24] Richardson also uses cipher's meanings of nobody, monogram, and arithmetic in his novels. In *Clarissa*, Arabella, Clarissa's sister, accuses Clarissa of bewitching people with her "bewitching *meek* pride, and *humble* significance," so that "nobody could be valued or respected but must stand like cyphers wherever [Clarissa] came" (194). Near the end of the novel, Clarissa draws her will where she bequeaths to Lady Betty Lawrance, Lady Sarah Sadleir, Lord M., Miss Charlotte and Miss Martha Montague "each an enamelled ring, with a cypher Cl. H. with my hair in crystal, and round the inside of each, the day, month, and year of my death" (1416). In the eighteenth century, cipher could also be used as a verb to refer to the act of doing arithmetic. Chambers lists an entry for "cyphering" and defines it as "popularly used for the art of accompting; properly called *arithmetic*." Near the end of the novel, Pamela is in charge of charity on Mr. B's estates. She promises to keep a book for ciphering, the most important kind of writing she would do henceforth:

> I am resolved to keep account of all these matter: and Mr. Longman has already furnished me with a vellum book of white paper; some sides of which I hope soon to fill, with the names of proper objects. And though my beloved master has given me all this without account, yet shall he see, (but nobody else) how I lay it out from quarter to quarter; and I will, if any be left, carry it on, like an accomptant, to the next quarter, and strike a balance four times a year, and a general balance at every year's end. And I have written in it, *Humble* RETURNS *for* DIVINE MERCIES. And locked it up in my newly-presented cabinet. (*P* 490)

Burney, her initial anonymity can certainly be read as a cipher, for her true identity requires deciphering. However, I think the cipher provides more than a near synonym for her anonymity. Rather, the cipher encapsulates Burney's journey to and model of authorship. This reading is made possible by scrutinizing the first frontispiece as the only moment where Burney the author and Evelina the character become nearly indistinguishable from each other. Due to the ambiguity of the female figure's identity, the frontispiece, Doody argues,

> represents a conflation of external world (author, Muse) with the internal world of the tale—the story of the Belmonts. If—as makes sense within the context of the story—the tomb is the mother's, at last properly acknowledged with her name on it, then the first two lines of the verse which appear underneath refer not to the idea of father, but to the idea of *mother*. ("Oh author of my being!") The mother, the feminine side, the female author's muse, must be acknowledged, and that which has been buried (like the author's real name) should be honored by being named aright. The father, as in the Belmont story which gives rise to Evelina's story, should recognize the daughter, permitting her at once both her relation to him, and her true identity. (*Frances Burney* 32–33)

The female in the frontispiece is both Evelina and Burney. This ambiguity makes the frontispiece the only instance where conflating Burney's life and work is legitimate. Hence, Burney is also a cipher whose positionality binds her to a figure. In the poem and the preface, Burney yields to male figures (i.e. her father and male novelists). Though Burney's presenting Evelina's face and writing as monogram- and code-ciphers does promote vertical and horizontal female bonding, this kind of positionality occurs in the novel and therefore cannot be readily applied to Burney's authorship. Only through the

identification between Burney and her heroine in the frontispiece can we assert that Burney is attaching herself to a female figure, to what Doody calls "[t]he mother, the feminine side, the female author's muse."

When Burney mentioned the frontispieces in her letter to Samuel Crisp on May 4, 1779, she was simultaneously finishing *The Witlings*, a play prompted by Richardson Sheridan, who in January of the same year encouraged Burney to write a comedy (*EJL* 3:234). However, Burney's dream of becoming a playwright was crushed in August by Charles Burney and Crisp, her "two Daddys [who] put their Heads together to concert for me that Hissing, groaning, catcalling Epistle" to forbid her from publishing the play (*EJL* 3:350). This incident happened three months before the fourth edition of *Evelina* was published. Could Burney have been emboldened by the incident to encrypt a message of authorial independence in the first frontispiece? We do not know. What we do know is that while Burney felt ambivalent about fame and the public in the years following *Evelina*'s publication in 1778, she was determined to be an author. On July 5, 1778, Burney wrote to her sister Susanna to reflect on the favourable reception of *Evelina* and to speculate on what could happen to her second novel. She compares her literary journey to climbing a mountain:

> I am now at the *summit* of a high Hill,—my prospects, on one side, are bright, glowing, & invitingly beautiful;—but when I turn round, I perceive, on the other side, sundry Caverns, Gulphs, pits & precipices, that to *look at*, make my Head giddy, & my Heart sick!—I see about me, indeed, many Hills of far greater height & sublimity;—but I have not the strength to attempt climbing them. (*EJL* 3:36)

She tries to persuade herself that "to *stand still* will be my best policy," but she immediately rejects the thought, for "there is nothing under Heaven so difficult to do!—Creatures who are formed for motion, *must* move, however great their inducements to forbear" (*EJL* 3:36). By the end of the letter, Burney regains her confidence and aspires to keep writing because "the temptations before me are *almost* irresistible" (*EJL* 3:36–37).[25] In the remainder of her literary career, Burney wrote three novels, eight plays, a memoir of her father, and copious letters and journals. She continued to use the trope of cipher in many of her works, especially the novels. Meaning nobody or initials, cipher appears once in *The Witlings* (1779), twice in *Cecilia* (1782), four times in *Camilla* (1796), and three times in *The Wanderer* (1814).[26] In her private journals, Burney only references cipher once. On January 19, 1783, Burney described her visit to Mary Delany, a decoupage artist and Bluestocking. She observed that Delany made notes about the floral and plant patterns for the decoupage works: "She has marked the places whence they all came on the back, & where she did them, & the year; & she has put her Cypher, MD. at the corner of each, in different coloured Letters for every different year, such as

[25] Burney's description of the sublimity of the caverns, gulphs, pits, and precipices evokes the Burkean sublime. She feels giddy and sick at the sight of the metaphorical caverns, gulphs, pits, and precipices because she is experiencing fear and terror, the main source of the sublime in Burke's *Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. Burney does not simply present writing as a source of the sublime. In fact, she maps the development of her future writing onto the progression of astonishment, the strongest effect of the sublime. As Burke explains:

> astonishment is that state of the soul in which all its motions are suspended, with some degree of horror. In this case the mind is so entirely filled with its object, that it cannot entertain any other, nor by consequence reason on that object which employs it. Hence arises the great power of the sublime, that, far from being produced by them, it anticipates our reasonings, and hurries us on by an irresistible force. (53)

Burney's progressing from standing still to motion parallels Burke's movement from stasis to "an irresistible force."

[26] See *The Complete Plays of Frances Burney* 1:13; *Cecilia* 732, 742; *Camilla* 92, 145, 723, 817; *The Wanderer* 211, 573, 628.

red, blue, Green, &c" (*EJL* 5:287). Burney may not have officially signed her cipher in *Evelina*, but her evolving authorial identity between 1777 and 1779 can be decoded by the three types of cipher—monogram, code, zero—hidden in Volume III and the frontispiece to the first volume. Instead of being a throwaway simile in *Evelina*, the cipher provides a metaphor for Burney's authorship, one characterized by a duality between ostensible submission to the patriarchal society and cloistered affirmation of female authorship.

The World and the Dissenter Metaphor: Anna Letitia Barbauld's Canonization of Women Novelists in *The British Novelists*

As eighteenth-century novelists tried to define their authorial identities in their works, letters, and journals, they had little control over if and how their conceptualizations of authorship would be received by the reading public. A conscientious reader may be able to recognize Sterne's settlement metaphor or Burney's cipher metaphor in *Tristram* and *Evelina*, but only scholars would peruse Richardson's letters to identify the grafting metaphor. However explicit or implicit they were, the novelists' authorial identities were subjected to modifications as the works were made available to the readers through institutional forces: reviews, reprints, translations, anthologies, and school curricula.[1] In the last quarter of the eighteenth century, numerous anthologies appeared in the literary market and began to canonize the English literature. The explosion of anthologies was made possible by *Donaldson v. Becket* (1774), which ended the practice of perpetual copyright. Though the Statute of Anne (1710) stipulated copyright terms to be fourteen years (renewable for another fourteen years), the London

[1] For how schools shaped and disseminated the literary canon in the eighteenth and twentieth centuries, see John Guillory, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (U of Chicago P, 1993). For how anthologies both promoted and restricted access to knowledge, see William St. Clair, *The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period* (Cambridge UP, 2004), 66–83. For the history of the anthology as a genre, see Barbara M. Benedict, *Making the Modern Reader: Cultural Mediation in Early Modern Literary Anthologies* (Princeton UP, 1996). For the theoretical and philosophical differences between collections and selections, see Barbara M. Benedict, "The Paradox of the Anthology: Collecting and Difference in Eighteenth-Century Britain," *New Literary History* 34, no. 2 (2003): 231–56; and Michael Gamer, "A Select Collection: Barbauld, Scott, and the Rise of the (Reprinted) Novel," in *Recognizing the Romantic Novel: New Histories of British Fiction, 1780–1830*, ed. Jillian Heydt-Stevenson and Charlotte Sussman, (Liverpool UP, 2010), 155–91.

booksellers continued to enjoy a monopoly in the publishing industry by claiming that the ownership of copyright was, like land, perpetual. The decision of *Donaldson v. Becket* upheld the statuary terms of 1710 and thus released a plethora of texts into the public domain.[2] As Mark Rose explains, "the works of Shakespeare, Bacon, Milton, Bunyan, and others, all the great properties of the trade that the booksellers had been accustomed to treat as private landed estates, were suddenly declared open commons" (*Authors and Owners* 97). *Donaldson v. Becket* "opened the way for those without ownership of share-copies and outside the charmed circle of leading booksellers to publish cheap reprint editions of classic works," James Raven observes, "Dozens of new, modestly resourced publishers were the clear beneficiaries of the syndicates' loss of control over copyright. From the mid-1770s the reprinting of popular texts rejuvenated the market, and most notably the advancing provincial market" ("The Book Trades" 17). Seizing the opportunities afforded by this landmark decision, Scottish bookseller John Bell published a series of pocket-sized anthologies in uniform formats: *Shakespeare* (1774), the *British Theatre* (1776–78, 21 vols.), and *The Poets of Great Britain* (1777–82, 109 vols.). The London booksellers published the *Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets* (1779–81, 4 vols.), for which Samuel Johnson wrote the famous prefaces. These anthologies established what William St. Clair calls "the old canon": Samuel Butler, Chaucer, Collins, Cowper, Dryden, Falconer, Gay, Goldsmith, Gray, Milton, Pope, Shakespeare, Spenser, Thomson, and Young (128).[3]

---

[2] For analyses of *Donaldson v. Becket*, see Rose, *Authors and Owners*, 92–112; and St. Clair, *Reading Nation*, 103–21.

[3] For the differences between anthology, miscellany, abridgment, and collected works, see Benedict, "Paradox of the Anthology," 231; Leah Orr, *Novel Ventures: Fiction and Print Culture in England, 1690–*

Commissioned by a consortium of forty booksellers and edited by Anna Letitia Barbauld, *The British Novelists* (1810, 50 vols) was not the earliest anthology of novels, but it was the first major project at canonizing the novel.[4] In 1777, George Kearsly published *A Collection of Novels, Selected and Revised by Mrs. Griffith*, a three-volume anthology consisting of seven novels, three of which were by French novelists. James Harrison's *The Novelist's Magazine* (1780–89), comprising fifty-eight novels, was the first anthology of novels that gained commercial success.[5] From 1792 to 1808, Charles Cooke reprinted forty-two works in his editions of *Select Novels*. At the turn of the nineteenth century, these anthologies made novels more accessible to the reading public, yet none attempted to seriously canonize the novel with systematic prefaces.[6] *The British Novelists* includes an introductory essay ("On the Origin and Progress of Novel-Writing") and prefaces to all but one of the authors.[7] In addition to the comprehensive prefatory apparatus, *The British Novelists* also acquired prestige by its physical format. "Breaking with the traditional double columns and royal octavo format," Michael Gamer explains, "it adopted the larger print and smaller size of earlier poetic and dramatic collections. For the first time in decades, here was a collection of longer British fiction

1730 (U of Virginia P, 2017), 88; and Leah Price, *The Anthology and the Rise of the Novel: From Richardson to George Eliot* (Cambridge UP, 2000), 11.

[4] For the allotment of copies and shares of the publication among the forty booksellers, see William McCarthy, *Anna Letitia Barbauld: Voice of the Enlightenment* (Johns Hopkins UP, 2008), 652n43. For how anthologies and abridgments shaped the development of the novel, see Price, *Anthology and the Rise of the Novel*.

[5] For Harrison's *The Novelist's Magazine*, see Richard C. Taylor, "James Harrison, *The Novelist's Magazine*, and the Early Canonizing of the English Novel," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 33, no. 3 (1993): 629–43.

[6] Kearsly included a short preface to the anthology that mentions the novel's functions of entertainment and education, but no prefaces were added to the individual works. Neither Harrison nor Cooke included a general preface to their anthologies, but they both included prefaces to a small number of works.

[7] For reasons unknown, Barbauld did not write a preface for Francis Coventry, whose *History of Pompei the Little* was very popular in the eighteenth century.

published in a form unassociated with newsprint and professional records, and that more closely resembled Bell's elegant pocket volumes than Harrison's economic tomes" (179).

The British Novelists includes twenty-eight works by twenty-one authors, eight of whom are women. By including eight women novelists, it is seen by many as a celebration of female authorship. Terry Castle, for example, argues that *The British Novelists* "was in itself an act of feminist advocacy: out of the twenty-eight novels Barbauld included in the series, twelve were written by women" ("Women and Literary Criticism" 452). While the number of women novelists included in *The British Novelists* seems a clear promotion of women, the statistics of the prefaces and works tell a different and more complicated story. Barbauld's prefaces to the authors vary in length: the longest (Richardson's) is 48 pages, while the shortest (Maria Edgeworth's) is only half a page. Judging by the lengths of the prefaces, it may seem that Barbauld favors male novelists. Except for Burney's (11), the five longest prefaces are to men: Richardson (48), Henry Fielding (32), Tobias Smollett (18), and Oliver Goldsmith (12). The shortest prefaces are all to women: Edgeworth (0.5) and Frances Brooke (2). However, if we examine an author's importance in *The British Novelists* by calculating the amount of his or her works included in page numbers, the results are reversed. Of the six most anthologized authors—Richardson (5,574), Burney (1,667), Fielding (1,544), Ann Radcliffe (1,430), Charlotte Smith (701), and Edgeworth (679)—four are women (see Table 1). Comparing "the number of volumes a given author receives" and "the number of prefatory pages devoted to each author" with the chronology established in the essay, Gamer distinguishes three hierarchies of authors only to confirm "the primacy of Richardson"

Table 1

Contents of *The British Novelists*

Novelist	Work(s)	Work(s) Length (pp.)	Preface Length (pp.)	Work-Preface Ratio[a]
Samuel Richardson	*Clarissa* (vols. 1–8); *Sir Charles Grandison* (vols. 9–15)	5,574	48	116
Daniel Defoe	*Robinson Crusoe* (vols. 16–17)	654	8	82
Henry Fielding	*Joseph Andrews* (vol. 18); *Tom Jones* (vols. 19–21)	1,544	32	48
Horace Walpole	*Castle of Otranto* (vol. 22)	129	3	43
Clara Reeve	*Old English Baron* (vol. 22)	174	3	58
Francis Coventry	*History of Pompei the Little* (vol. 23)	167	0	NA
Oliver Goldsmith	*Vicar of Wakefield* (vol. 23)	205	12	17
Charlotte Lennox	*Female Quixote* (vol. 24–25)	503	4	126
John Hawkesworth	*Almoran and Hamet* (vol. 26)	119	2	60
Samuel Johnson	*Rasselas* (vol. 26)	133	8	17
Frances Brooke	*Julia Mandeville* (vol. 27)	212	2	106
Elizabeth Inchbald	*Nature and Art* (vol. 27); *A Simple Story* (vol. 28)	517	4	129
Henry Mackenzie	*Man of Feeling* (vol. 29); *Julia de Roubigné* (vol. 29)	274	3	91
Tobias Smollett	*Humphrey Clinker* (vols. 30–31)	484	18	27
Richard Graves	*Spiritual Quixote* (vols. 32–33)	644	5	129
John Moore	*Zeluco* (vols. 34–35)	501	7	72
Charlotte Smith	*The Old Manor House* (vols. 36–37)	701	8	88
Frances Burney	*Evelina* (vols. 38–39); *Cecilia* (vols. 40–41)	1,667	11	152
Ann Radcliffe	*Romance of the Forest* (vols. 43–44); *Mysteries of Udolpho* (vols. 45–47)	1,430	8	179
Robert Bage	*Hermsprong* (vol. 48)	352	3	117
Maria Edgeworth	*Belinda* (vols. 49–50); *Modern Griselda* (vol. 50)	679	1	1,358

[a] The smaller the number, the longer the preface is proportionally to the work.

(182). He points out that Burney and Radcliffe receive the second most volumes in the collection, but he does not explain the significance of this fact in relation to the hierarchies. "The contents of *The British Novelists* imply a story," William McCarthy argues, "in the century since Defoe, the earliest writer included, the British novel has evolved from a mostly masculine to a mostly feminine form; it has become a preeminent stage for the display of female genius. In fiction, the story says, the leading writers are now women" (*Voice of the Enlightenment* 426). To assess the validity of this claim, we must move beyond mere numbers and resort to qualitative, rather than quantitative, analysis of the prefaces. Sabine Volk-Birke maintains that Barbauld's prefaces, "although usually a combination of biography, plot summary, and criticism, are never schematic. She dispenses prestige usually through length and detailed judgment" (227). Barbauld's *usual* way of dispensing prestige may be sufficient for discussing individual women novelists, but it is inadequate to deciphering Barbauld's cryptic and often inconsistent attitude toward female authorship. To pinpoint Barbauld's stance on female authorship, I will use her preface to Burney, the longest among women novelists, as the key to trace the patterns of her treatments of novelists' lives and works in *The British Novelists*. Consistently downplaying fathers and husbands in women novelists' prefaces, Barbauld attempts to move the BIRTHING metaphor from paternity to maternity in her conceptualization of female authorship. By unearthing how women novelists' separation from the world is informed by dissenters' relationship with the world in her polemical writings, I argue that Barbauld attempts to use the dissenter metaphor to help her enshrine female authorship, but ultimately the project collapses as a result of Barbauld's ambivalence toward her gender.

Giving to the World

Barbauld opens her preface to Burney with a high praise: "SCARCELY any name, if any, stands higher in the list of novel-writers than that of Miss BURNEY, now Mrs. D'ARBLAY" (*BN* 38:i). On *Cecelia*, Barbauld comments that "the author draws from life, and exhibits not only the passions of human nature, but the manners of the age and the affectation of the day" (*BN* 38:vii). Regarding the representation of fops in *Camilla*, Barbauld writes: "The author appears to have viewed with a very discerning eye the manners of those young men who aspire to lead the fashion; and in all three of her novels has bestowed a good deal of her satire upon the affected apathy, studied negligence, coarse slang, avowed selfishness, or mischievous frolic, by which they often distinguish themselves, and through which they contrive to be vulgar with the advantages of rank, mean with those of fortune, and disagreeable with those of youth" (*BN* 38:viii–ix). Barbauld concludes that "[i]n short, Mrs. D'Arblay has observed human nature, both in high and low life, with the quick and penetrating eye of genius" (*BN* 38:x). However penetrating or discerning Burney's eye is, Barbauld never once describes her, or any other women novelists, as possessing "knowledge of the world," one of the highest praises Barbauld bestows in *The British Novelists*. As successful as *Pamela* was, Barbauld criticizes Richardson for "the knowledge of the great world he had yet to acquire" ("Life of Samuel Richardson" lxxvii). Richardson's shortcoming is overcome in *Sir Charles Grandison*, where he creates a more diverse set of characters and shows that "he had improved in the knowledge of life and the genteel world" (*BN* 1:xxxiv). For Barbauld, possessing or demonstrating knowledge of the world is one of the highest

praises for a novelist. Fielding's *Tom Jones*, Barbauld commends, is "a novel produced when the author was in the meridian of his faculties, and after he had joined to his natural talents experience of the world, mature judgement, and practice in the art of writing" (*BN* 18:xix). The characteristics of Smollett's style, Barbauld concludes, "are strong masculine humour, a knowledge of the world, particularly of the vicious part of it, and great force in drawing his characters; but of grace and amenity he had no idea. Neither had he any finesse" (*BN* 30:xv). On John Moore and Robert Bage, whose novels were popular in the eighteenth century but have since fallen out of the canon, Barbauld also praises that the former's *Zeluco* displays "the real knowledge of the world," and the latter's *The Man As He Is* is "the work of a man who knows the world, and has reflected upon what he has seen" (*BN* 34:iv, 48:iii).[8]

Barbauld may not praise Burney's acuity as knowledge of the world, but she does put Burney and other women novelists in a unique relationship with the world: giving. Recounting Burney's publications, Barbauld writes: "She has given to the world three productions of this kind"; "She now again resumed her pen, and gave to the world her third publication, entitled *Camilla*" (*BN* 38:i, vii). On Lennox, Barbauld writes that "she gave to the world *Shakespear Illustrated*, in three volumes" (*BN* 24:i). Smith's *Sonnets*, "which was the first publication she gave to the world," Barbauld comments, "were

[8] The closest expression is found in her preface to Smith, whose works "show a knowledge of life, and of genteel life" (*BN* 36:vi). Barbauld's phrasing here resembles hers on Richardson ("he had improved in the knowledge of life and the genteel world"), but "world" is noticeably missing in Smith's preface. In one of her letters to Edgeworth, Barbauld praises the novelist for her knowledge of the world: "How much have we all to thank you for of entertainment and instruction, how admirably have you contrived to join fancy, interest, knowledge of the world, sound sense, useful morality in the various pieces which with so rich and flowing a vein of instruction you have poured out before us" (Le Breton 90). This may be one of the only instances in which Barbauld associates women with knowledge of the world.

universally admired" (*BN* 36:iii). Long before *The British Novelists*, Barbauld describes publishing her *Devotional Pieces* (1775) as sending her child into the world: "I am afraid *my poor child* is tossing upon the waves, for I have not heard yet of its arrival in London; and I cannot help feeling all a parent's anxiety for its fate and establishment in the world" (*Works* 2:4–5). In her memoir of Hester Mulso Chapone, Barbauld thus introduces her works: "The first productions of hers, which were given to the world, were, the interesting story of *Fidelia*, in the *Adventurer*; and a Poem, prefixed to her friend Mrs. Carter's Translation of *Epictetus*" ("[Memoir of Hester Mulso Chapone]" 39). Women authors do not have a monopoly on the expression "give to the world"; Barbauld uses it to describe the publications of male authors—Richardson, Moore, and Bage—too.[9] It may seem that Barbauld's way of characterizing women authors' giving their works to the world is not unique, but a pattern starts to emerge when we examine women's relationship to the world from a bird's-eye view. Expected to acquire professional knowledge and enter society, men can interact with the world in various ways. They can rise in it, as Fielding did: "Thus advantageously ushered into life, from the situation and connexions of both parents, our author had every reasonable prospect of rising in the world" (*BN* 18:i); they can, like Goldsmith after quitting the University of Edinburgh, see it: "The world was now all before him, and he there fore resolved to see it, and accordingly embarked immediately for Holland" (*BN* 23:ii); or they can converse

[9] See *BN* 1:xxxii, 34:iv, 48:ii. Barbauld also describes Richardson's work as a bookseller in relation to world: "But the genius of Richardson was not destined to be for ever employed in ushering into the world the productions of others" (*BN* 1:viii). Interestingly, Barbauld describes Richardson's and William Congreve's publications as "given to the public," but she never describes women authors' works in this way.

with it like Smollett: "He had largely conversed with the world, and travelled, so that his delineations of character and adventures are as different as possible from the effusions of the sentimental theorist" (*BN* 30:xv). In contrast, women novelists are never described as interacting directly with the world, except in the form of giving their works to the world.

In the prefaces to women novelists, this sense of separation from the world is frequently accompanied by an abridgment of their lives in the areas of family, education, marriage, and career. Regarding Burney's illustrious father, Dr. Charles Burney, one of the most famous musicians and musical scholars of the eighteenth century, Barbauld merely describes him as "the ingenious Dr. BURNEY," without even mentioning his first name (*BN* 38:i). As for Burney's husband, Alexandre D'Arblay, Barbauld mentions him in passing when she describes Burney's tenure as second keeper of the robes to Queen Charlotte and her immigrating to France (*BN* 38:vii, x–xi).[10] Barbauld provides even fewer details about many other women novelists' lives. She says nothing about the parents or husbands of Reeve, Lennox, Inchbald, and Edgeworth. Facts about Brookes' parents and husband are condensed into a single sentence: "FRANCES BROOKES whose maiden name was Moore, an elegant and accomplished woman, was the wife of a clergyman" (*BN* 27:i). At the very end of her preface to Radcliffe, Barbauld casually mentions that "Mrs. Radcliffe has also published, jointly with her husband, *Travels in Germany and Holland*" (*BN* 43:viii). In contrast, Barbauld devotes much more space to

[10] McCarthy speculates that Barbauld may have sympathized with Burney's miserable time at court: "Barbauld writes with feeling also about Burney's immurement at Court after the success of *Cecilia*. Her indignation is as evident here as it is in her letter to Rochemont. . . . I find it difficult to believe that Barbauld was not, at the moment of writing this, re-experiencing her resentment of the college proposal" ("Why Anna Letitia Barbauld Refused" 356).

detailing the familial and educational backgrounds of male novelists. Not surprisingly, Barbauld devotes eight and six pages respectively to detailing Richardson's and Fielding's family, education, careers, and marriages. Three pages shorter than Burney's, Defoe's preface still manages to mention both his father and his education: "born in London in 1663; his father was a butcher; his education was a common one, and none of his works bear any marks of the polish and elegance of style which is the mingled result of a classical education, and of associating with the more cultivated orders of society" (*BN* 16:i). Barbauld's treatments of male novelists' lives are not consistent. While she includes no personal detail in her prefaces to Hawkesworth, Mackenzie, and Johnson, those to Graves, Moore, and Bage, which are of comparable lengths to women novelists', consist at least half of their lives. What becomes clear is that Barbauld never abridges male novelists' lives as significantly or consistently as she does to women novelists.

Considering the social norms of the eighteenth century, it is understandable why Barbauld says little about women novelists' education and career. As Barbauld explains in "On Female Studies" (1787), "[t]he line of separation between the studies of a young man and a young woman appears to me to be chiefly fixed by this,—that a woman is excused from all professional knowledge. Professional knowledge means all that is necessary to fit a man for a peculiar profession or business" (*SPP* 475). Since none of the women novelists received formal education, Barbauld could not possibly document their academic or intellectual itineraries. Since most of them had no other professions other than an author, Barbauld could not have discussed their accomplishments in, for example,

law, medicine, or church.[11] However, the absence of any discussion on many women novelists' families and marriages is less understandable, for Barbauld could have easily obtained facts and details from many sources.[12] Her preface to Smith, which is rich with colorful details about the novelist's family, upbringing, marriage, and children, proves that Barbauld could have used, but chose not to, sources. From the "Memoir of Mrs. Charlotte Smith," published in the *Monthly Magazines* (April 1807), Barbauld borrowed not only facts but also passages about Smith's life.[13] Barbauld's brother, John Aikin, was the literary editor of the *Monthly Magazines*, and Barbauld herself published several poems and essays there in the 1790s. In light of her relationship with the *Monthly Magazines*, it is not impossible that Barbauld could have used the magazine's obituaries of Reeve (1807) and Lennox (1804) as the sources for her prefaces in *The British Novelists*. Though it is unclear why Smith of all women novelists received Barbauld's special treatment, it demonstrates that Barbauld could have included more details about the women novelists' lives, if she had wanted to.

---

[11] In addition to being authors, Inchbald was an actress, and Edgeworth was an educationist, but Barbauld does not include these facts in the prefaces. She does mention, however, that Brooke "had at one time a share in the management of the Opera House" (*BN* 27:i)

[12] In *The British Novelists*, Barbauld identifies the sources for her prefaces but once when she references John Moore's memoir of Smollett from *The Works of Tobias Smollett* (1797): "A Memoir of this author by Dr. Moore, his friend and countryman, is prefixed to an edition of his Works, from which the facts in this account are chiefly taken" (*BN* 30:xv).

[13] Compare, for example, Barbauld's description of the Smiths' moving to Normandy with the memoir:

> "the increasing derangement of Mr. Smith's affairs soon afterwards obliged them to leave England; and they were settled some time in a large gloomy chateau in Normandy" (*BN* 36:iii).
>
> "The still encreasing derangement of Mr. Smith's affairs soon after obliged him to leave England, and in the autumn of 1784, he established his family in a gloomy and inconvenient chateau in Normandy" (*Monthly Magazine* 246).

Dissenters and the World

Barbauld's characterization of women's relationship to the world in *The British Novelists* creates a sense of separation: women can experience the world (i.e. seeing, rising, conversing) only vicariously through their works. This kind of separation is rarely found in Barbauld's description of men and the world. However, we find at least one instance where Barbauld conjures up a similar separation from the world in her memoir of her late husband, Reverend Rochemont Barbauld. While editing *The British Novelists,* Barbauld experienced personal difficulties with Rochemont, who suffered mental disorders toward the end of his life and committed suicide in 1808. In her "Memoir of the Rev. R. Barbauld," published anonymously in the *Monthly Repository*, Barbauld thus concludes her husband's career as a dissenter and Unitarian preacher: "Nothing prevented him from being a popular preacher, but the weakness of his voice, and a foreign accent, which he could never entirely get rid of. These confined him to small congregations, which damped his ardour, and gave rise to depressing feelings, for he passed through the world without courting it, and never, perhaps, was in a situation which gave his talents full play" (709). Rochemont does enter the world ("passed through") as Barbauld's male novelists do, but he takes no action ("without courting it"). Barbauld's elegiac tone of recounting Rochemont's disappointment and unfulfillment puts an invisible, impenetrable wall around him, separated from the world as the women novelists are in *The British Novelists*.

Rochemont's separation from the world may have been caused by his personal temperament, but his identity as a dissenter is also instrumental to how Barbauld portrays

his relationship with the world. Descended from a family of French Huguenots refuged in England, Rochemont attended the Warrington Academy in 1767 and met Anna Letitia Aikin, whose father, Reverend John Aikin, had been a tutor of languages, literature, and divinity at the Academy since 1758. Before she married Rochemont and moved to Palgrave, Suffolk, to open a school for boys in 1774, Barbauld had been nourished by the dissenting community at Warrington for sixteen years and grown into a staunch dissenter. In "Thoughts on the Devotional Taste, on Sects, and on Establishments," prefaced to *Devotional Pieces* (1775), Barbauld contrasts sects, of which dissenters are certainly one, with the established churches. A sect, Barbauld argues, is characterized by "its first plainness, simplicity, and affectionate zeal" (*SPP* 227). Because of the ardor of its believers' zeal, a sect is always in motion: "a sect is never stationary, as it depends entirely on passions and opinions; though it often attains excellence, it never rests in it, but is always in danger of one extreme or the other: whereas an old establishment, whatever else it may want, possesses the grandeur arising from stability" (*SPP* 227). In this context, Barbauld imagines the dissenting preacher (e.g. Rochemont) as someone superior to the world around him:

> The *minister* of a sect, and of an establishment, is upon very different footing. The former is like the popular leader of an army; he is obeyed with enthusiasm while he is obeyed at all; but his influence depends on opinion, and is entirely personal: the latter resembles a general appointed by the monarch; he has soldiers less warmly devoted to him, but more steady, and better disciplined. The dissenting teacher is nothing, if he have not the spirit of a martyr; and is the scorn of the world, if he be not above the world. (*SPP* 227–28)

Though not a martyr, Rochemont stands out from the world like the dissenting teacher Barbauld describes here. Sadly, Rochemont's less-than-stellar career leaves him sidelined by the world rather than rising above it.

Barbauld's motif of dissenters' separation from the world receives new urgency in the movement to repeal the Corporation and Test Acts from 1787 to 1790. Passed after the Civil War under Charles II, the Corporation Act (1661) and the Test Act (1672) required persons holding public offices to take the Sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England, and to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy.[14] Dissenters, as well as Catholics, were thus barred from government and military offices. Furthermore, dissenters were also barred from attending universities at Oxford and Cambridge, so dissenting academies, of which Warrington was one, were established to provide education to dissenting families.[15] Throughout the eighteenth century, dissenters repeatedly appealed to repeal the Corporation and Test Acts. In 1787 and 1789, Henry Beaufoy, MP for Minehead and a Warrington graduate, introduced two motions to repeal the two Acts, and he fervently supported Charles James Fox's motion to repeal in 1790. Despite the debates stirred by the movement, the Parliament did not pass the motions, disappointing and angering many dissenters. Amidst these debates, Barbauld published

[14] The Corporation Act is the first of four anti-nonconformist acts known as the Clarendon Code. The other three acts are: the Act of Uniformity (1662), the Conventicle Act (1664), and the Five Mile Act (1665).
[15] "In order to matriculate at Oxford it was necessary to subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles and take the Oath of Supremacy, and therefore Dissenters could not attend, but they could attend Cambridge, though there they were disqualified from taking degrees" (White 193n34). John Guillory credits dissenting academies for their contribution to institutionalizing the English literature: "If the 'middling sort,' especially those trained in the Dissenting Academies, embraced English literature as a politically empowering educational program, because it facilitated entrance into the relatively homogenized linguistic arena of the 'public sphere,' this revaluation of the cultural capital of vernacular literary works was responsible for the emergence of the category of literature itself, as well as for the first crisis in the status of the vernacular canon, the problem of assimilating new vernacular genres such as the novel" (xi).

"An Address to the Opposers of the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts" in 1790 to defend her fellow dissenters. Refuting the opposers' claim that dissenters are motivated by material greed, Barbauld proclaims that "We rather wished this act as the removal of a stigma than the possession of a certain advantage, and we might have been cheaply pleased with the acknowledgment of the right, though we had never been fortunate enough to enjoy the emolument" (*SPP* 263–64). In her defense of dissenters and their rights, Barbauld again uses the separation-from-the-world motif to characterize the dissenter, who "is not of the world, Gentlemen, and the world loveth her own" (*SPP* 265).[16] This time, Barbauld underscores how regardless their wish to blend into the society, dissenters are forced to stand out as a distinct group:

> What we desire, by blending us with the common mass of citizens, would have sunk our relative importance, and consigned our discussions to oblivion. You have refused us; and by so doing, you keep us under the eye of the public, in the interesting point of view of men who suffer under a deprivation of their rights. You have set a mark of separation upon us, and it is not in our power to take it off, but it is in our power to determine whether it shall be a disgraceful stigma or an honourable distinction. (*SPP* 272)

Barbauld wears the involuntary "mark of separation" as a badge of honor. The passage elucidates how dissenters stand out from the rest of the world: they form a distinct community, and they are determined to achieve "an honourable distinction" with resilience. Turning discrimination into empowerment, Barbauld concludes that "If, in short, we render ourselves worthy of respect, you cannot hinder us from being

[16] William McCarthy and Elizabeth Kraft note that Barbauld is alluding to John 8:23 and 15:19 (*SPP* 265n1)

respected—you cannot help respecting us—and in spite of all names of opprobrious separation, we shall be bound together by mutual esteem and the mutual reciprocation of good offices" (*SPP* 273).[17]

When Barbauld presents writing (i.e. giving to the world) as the only means of women novelists' relationship with the world, she is drawing on the motif of dissenter versus the world to describe a sense of separation. This tacit equivalence between dissenters and women novelists helps to substantiate the political undertone suggested by some critics. For example, Claudia L. Johnson argues that

> In Barbauld's formulation, novelistic canons supplement, critique, or contest political systems rather than displace or stand as alternatives to them. Her first, short-lived tradition of the British novel imagined novel and the nation alike as responsive to dissent (neither constituted by the Reaction to the French Revolution, however much it took cognizance of it, nor by the Napoleonic Wars), as inclusive of difference, and as foundationally inviting to women. (177)

Teasing out different hierarchies between Barbauld's introductory essay and the actual collection of *The British Novelists*, Gamer maintains that "while Barbauld's introduction provides a kind of official historiography, its contents and arrangement present readers with very different view. Using these latter registers, we find a novel that opens with Richardson and closes with Edgeworth—a novel, moreover, epistolary in nature and dissenting in flavour, dominated by women writers after 1770" (182). Johnson and Gamer both speculate that some kind of essential relationship exists between women and

[17] For Barbauld's consistent cultivation of a political, subversive authorial identity, see Kelly E. Battles, "Anna Barbauld's Authorial Self-Fashioning: From 'Fair Pedagogue' to 'Fatidical Spinster,'" *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 44, no. 1 (2015): 143–62.

dissent in *The British Novelists*, but neither can provide textual evidence. McCarthy suggests a more plausible link between women and dissenters when he ponders on Barbauld's contrasting between Oxford/Cambridge and the Warrington Academy in "Prologue to the Play of Henry the Eighth. Spoken by a Warrington Student in his morning Gown": "Being a Dissenter meant that Anna Letitia could merge her own sense of second-class standing as a woman into sympathy with her disadvantaged coreligionists; the latter might be said to carry the former as a stowaway or secret sharer" (*Voice of the Enlightenment* 89). A sort of sympathy does seem to exist in Barbauld's mind between women and dissenters, but the bond is stronger than the "second-class standing": sensibility.

Before she expounds the characteristics of sects in "Thoughts on the Devotional Taste, on Sects, and on Establishments," Barbauld defends the devotional approach to religion, which may "be considered as a taste, an affair of sentiment and feeling, and in this sense it is properly called Devotion" (*SPP* 211). She aims her criticism at rational Dissenters, especially Unitarians, whose overemphasis on reason and disputation in their preaching dampens piety: "It is the character of the present age to allow little to sentiment, and all the warm and generous emotions are treated as romantic by the supercilious brow of a cold-hearted philosophy" (*SPP* 212). To remedy this cold-heartedness, Barbauld urges a cultivation of devotion, which is "generous, liberal, and humane, the child of more exalted feelings than base minds can enter into, which assimilates man to higher natures, and lifts him 'above this visible diurnal sphere'" (*SPP*

212).[18] If sentiments and emotions are crucial to Barbauld's brand of Dissent, they figure just as prominently in her portrayal of female authorship in *The British Novelists*. After reviewing the genealogy of English novelists, which consists mainly of men, in "On the Origin and Progress of Novel-Writing," Barbauld pauses to ask:

> Why is it that women when they write are apt to give a melancholy tinge to their compositions? Is it that they suffer more, and have fewer resources against melancholy? Is it that men, mixing at large in society, have a brisker flow of ideas, and, seeing a greater variety of characters, introduce more of the business and pleasures of life into their productions? Is it that humour is a scarcer product of the mind than sentiment, and more congenial to the stronger powers of man? Is it that women nurse those feelings in secrecy and silence, and diversify the expression of them with endless shades of sentiment, which are more transiently felt, and with fewer modifications of delicacy, by the other sex? The remark, if true, has no doubt many exceptions; but the productions of several ladies, both French and English, seem to countenance it. (*BN* 1:42)

Barbauld's association of women and sentiment is a product of the culture of sensibility, so her argument is neither original nor innovative. But by distilling the aptitude for sentiment into an essence of female authorship, Barbauld is endowing women novelists with a distinct, recognizable identity. This community of women authors, who give their writings to the world but do not directly engage with it, share with dissenters a propensity for sentiment, an imposed separation from the world, and a resilient spirit that overcomes obstacles. By restricting women's interactions with the world to publication alone,

[18] For how Barbauld's appeal to sensibility reclaims the Puritan devotion and her Dissenting beliefs amidst various nonconformist traditions (i.e. Arminianism, Arianism, Presbyterianism, Unitarianism), see Daniel E. White, *Early Romanticism and Religious Dissent* (Cambridge UP, 2006), 34–65.

Barbauld is invoking the dissenter as a metaphor for women novelists: they form a prominent community and stand out from male authors.

Female Genius vs. Female Junto

Interpreting Barbauld's *The British Novelists* as a feminist project, McCarthy even claims that "[o]ne of Barbauld's aims in *The British Novelists* was to vindicate female genius" (*Voice of the Enlightenment* 427). Barbauld uses "female genius" to characterize Elizabeth Carter and Hester Mulso Chapone in "The Life of Samuel Richardson." After discussing Richardson's depictions of learned women in his novels and his contemporaries' prejudice against women's cultivation, Barbauld turns to describe how far women's education has improved in her time:

> What would some of these critics have said, could they have heard young ladies talking of gases, and nitrous oxyd, and stimuli, and excitability, and all the terms of modern science. The restraint of former times was painful and humiliating; what can be more humiliating than the necessity of affecting ignorance? and yet, perhaps, it is not undesirable that female genius should have something to overcome; so much, as to render it probable, before a woman steps out of the common walks of life, that her acquirements are solid, and her love for literature decided and irresistible. These obstacles did not prevent the Epictetus of Mrs. Carter, nor the volumes of Mrs. Chapone, from being written and given to the world. ("Life of Samuel Richardson" clxiv)

This is Barbauld's first and only reference to female genius. In *The British Novelists*, Barbauld uses genius to praise both male and women novelists, but she never specifies the latter as *female* genius.[19]

As much as women novelists are standouts, Barbauld seems to have reservations about a coherent, homogeneous female authorship. After proposing that an aptitude for sentiment is shared by all women authors, she gives a list of possible explanations for the aptitude ranging from environmental (women's places in society deprive them of many resources) to temperamental (women feel more strongly and differently from men) without committing to any explanation. She presents these hypothetical answers only to gloss them over, for she is interested in the "remark," the (in)disputable fact that women "are apt to give a melancholy tinge to their compositions." The dissenter metaphor, however empowering in its demarcating the boundary of female authorship, is too obscure, keeping women in the dark as opposed to the visibility dissenters experience. Part of Barbauld's reservations in *The British Novelists* may be explained by her skepticism about essentializing authorship. When Edgeworth wrote in July 1804 to inquire if Barbauld would contribute to her father's proposed project, "a periodical paper, to be written entirely by ladies," Barbauld declined (Le Breton 84). In her reply, Barbauld explains why she objects to the proposal:

> all the literary ladies! Mercy on us! Have you ever reckoned up how many there are, or computed how much trash, and how many discordant materials would be

[19] For Barbauld's discussion of self-taught geniuses (i.e. Shakespeare, Richardson), see Barbauld, "Life of Samuel Richardson," xxxv–xxxvi. Castle observes that "the celebration of original or 'untutored' genius—coupled with a rejection of learning and decorum—was a favourite topic" for many women critics from late seventeenth to early nineteenth centuries ("Women and Literary Criticism" 445).

> poured in from such a general invitation. I feel also doubtful of the propriety of making it declaredly a *lady's paper*. There is no bond of union among literary women, any more than among literary men; different sentiments and different connections separate them much more than the joint interest of their sex would unite them. Mrs. Hannah More would not write along with you or me, and we should probably hesitate at joining Miss Hays, or if she were living, Mrs. Godwin. (Le Breton 86–87)

She insists that a causal relationship does not exist between gender and authorship, cautioning Edgeworth that "there is a great difference between a paper written *by* a lady, and *as* a lady. To write professedly as a female junto seems in some measure to suggest a certain cast of sentiment, and you would write in trammels" (Le Breton 87). She is ready to celebrate works written by women, but she adamantly resists against reducing women's writing to a homogeneity ("a certain cast of sentiment"). "A female junto" is likely Barbauld's most explicit characterization of women authors, yet its consequential hinderance to authorship stand in stark contrast to the dissenter metaphor in *The British Novelists*. Had Barbauld changed her mind on female authorship when she wrote the prefaces in *The British Novelists*? Her other writings between 1804 and 1810 provide no additional clue. However, Barbauld's indecisiveness toward female author is not out of character in terms of her treatment of gender. Mary Wollstonecraft famously censures Barbauld's poem "To a Lady, with some painted Flowers" (1773), which compares women to flowers that "Were born for pleasure and delight alone" and that "Your best, your sweetest empire is—to please" (14, 18). In a footnote to her critique of women adopting men's rhetoric in *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792), Wollstonecraft quotes the entire poem and calls Barbauld's flower simile an "ignoble comparison"

(122n4).[20] Another famous critique of Barbauld by feminists concerns her rejection of a proposal to teach at a college for young ladies in 1774 on the grounds that

> young ladies, who ought only to have such a general tincture of knowledge as to make them agreeable companions to a man of sense, and to enable them to find rational entertainment for a solitary hour, should gain these accomplishments in a more quiet and unobserved manner:—subject to a regulation like that of the ancient Spartans, the thefts of knowledge in our sex are only connived at while carefully concealed, and if displayed, punished with disgrace. (*Works* 1:xvii–xviii)

However, this critique is misinformed because Barbauld's letter was taken out of context by her niece Lucy Aikin, who excerpted long passages from said letter in her memoir of Barbauld and made it seem that Barbauld's letter was addressed to Elizabeth Montague rather than Rochemont Barbauld.[21] As Catherine E. Moore comments, Barbauld's "reputation today—and in her time—is not that of an ardent feminist. A spokeswoman for radical dissenters . . . she was not notably interested in specifically feminist causes" (387–88). Compared to her vocal and unwavering support for dissenters, Barbauld's stance on female authorship, on whether a woman author could or should write as a lady, is ambivalent.

On *Evelina*'s title page in the thirty-eighth volume of *The British Novelists*, the subtitle of the novel is printed as "The History of a Young Lady's Introduction to the

---

[20] Barbauld responds to Wollstonecraft's criticism in "The Rights of Women" (1792). For Barbauld's treatment of gender and women's rights in this poem, see *SPP* 130 and G. J Barker-Benfield, *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (U of Chicago P, 1992), 266.
[21] For Aikin's introduction of the letter, see *Works* xvi. For the full context of the letter and the reasons Aikin deliberately misled her reader, see William McCarthy, "Why Anna Letitia Barbauld Refused to Head a Women's College: New Facts, New Story," *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 23, no. 3 (2001): 349–79.

World," but the correct subtitle should be "The History of A Young Lady's *Entrance* into the World" (emphasis added). *Evelina*'s entire plot revolves around her entering the world, yet Barbauld never once references the subtitle, nor does she use "world" in her analysis of the novel.[22] The absence of world around *Evelina* is interestingly foiled by Johnson's *Rasselas*, a philosophical tale about the Prince of Abbissinia's entrance into the world in search of happiness. Unlike *Evelina*, Barbauld's discussion of abounds with the characters' various relationships with the world: secluded from, desiring to see, acquainted and disgusted with it (*BN* 26:i, ii, iii). Structured similarly to those of women novelists', Johnson's preface is devoid of details about his personal life. The only biographical detail Barbauld includes regards the motivation for writing *Rasselas*: "composed for the purpose of enabling the author to visit his mother in her last illness, and for defraying the expenses of her funeral" (*BN* 26:vii). At eight pages long, Johnson's preface is about the average length of all prefaces in *The British Novelists*. However, if we measure authors' relative importance in the anthology by calculating how long their prefaces are proportionally to their works, Johnson's emerges as the longest (see Table 1). The hidden importance of Johnson's preface may point to a path of authorship that complements the dissenter metaphor. A poet, essayist, critic, and lexicographer, Johnson embodied what a professional author, one who lived entirely by his or her pen, could be.

[22] All eighteenth-century editions of *Evelina* printed "The History of A Young Lady's Entrance into the World" as its subtitle. It is unclear if the replacement of "Entrance" by "Introduction" was intentional or by mistake. Regarding Lennox's *Female Quixote*, another story about a young woman entering the world, Barbauld writes that Arabella "at her father's death she comes out into the world, possessed of beauty and fortune, but with a profound ignorance of every circumstance of real life and manners" (*BN* 24:i–ii). If Barbauld could describe Arabella as coming into the world, it is all the more curious why she would not associate the world with Evelina, perhaps one of the most well-known characters entering the world in the eighteenth century.

Comparing the careers of Johnson and Barbauld, McCarthy suggests that "the type of career to which she went on was Johnsonian: like Johnson she wrote poems, essays, politics, and literary commentary; like him she wrote for hire and came to preside over large publishing enterprises" (*Voice of the Enlightenment* 113–14). Consciously or not, Barbauld may have considered a Johnsonian model of authorship not only for herself but also for all women novelists. Though still faced with great obstacles in society and forced to stand out like the dissenters, women novelists could use their writing to claim their own place in the literary world.

As the longest among women novelists', the preface to Burney is the most likely site to uncover or reconstruct Barbauld's dissenter metaphor. However, the notion of the dissenter metaphor raises more questions in Burney's preface than it answers. By examining Barbauld's uses of "world" in relation to male and women novelists, we can indeed discern a pattern where women can only interact with the world indirectly by giving their works to it. The implications of community, separation, and prominence associate women with dissenters. The product of this pattern, the dissenter metaphor, is so underdeveloped that it cannot adequately contain Barbauld's ambivalent opinions on gender and authorship. We get a glimpse of Barbauld's ambivalence in her vacillating between addressing Burney as Miss Burney and Mrs. D'Arblay in the preface. She titles the preface "Miss Burney" and refers to the novelist as Miss Burney in the first half of the preface. After describing Burney's tenure as second keeper of the robes, Barbauld explains why Burney left the position: "Her state of health at length obliged her to resign it, and she was soon after married to M. D'Arblay, a French emigrant" (*BN* 38:vii). Afterwards, Barbauld switches to using Mrs. D'Arblay, as was widely used at the time, to

refer to the novelist.[23] Ultimately, the dissenter metaphor fails to materialize because her primary mission in *The British Novelists* is building a British canon of novels. In her conclusion to "On the Origin and Progress of Novel Writing," Barbauld meditates: "It was said by Fletcher of Saltoun, 'Let me make the ballads of a nation, and I care not who makes the laws.' Might it not be said with as much propriety, Let me make the novels of a country, and let who will make the systems?" (*BN* 1:59).[24] She did succeed in creating a canon of English novels, and she also elevated women novelists' status. While she may not have developed the dissenter metaphor into a systematic model for female authorship, her haphazard comments on female authorship scattered in *The British Novelists* and elsewhere do conform to her proposition for women's aptitude for sentiment: "women nurse those feelings in secrecy and silence, and diversify the expression of them with endless shades of sentiment, which are more transiently felt, and with fewer modifications of delicacy."

[23] The transition occurs between Burney's resignation and marriage, when she was wicked. No causal relationship is explicitly stated between Burney's illness and marriage, but the juxtaposition of the two events may give rise to that implication. The inconsistency between the title and the conclusion of the preface, where Burney is referred to as Miss Burney and Mrs. D'Arblay respectively, may be indicative of Barbauld's resistance against or repression of Burney's association with the French. For her other prefaces to women novelists, Barbauld titles them as either "Mrs. —" (Brooke, Lennox, Inchbald, Smith, and Radcliffe) or the novelist's full name (Reeve). Only Burney's and Edgeworth's prefaces are titled "Miss —".

[24] For how Barbauld responds to system as a genre in eighteenth century novel, see Clifford Siskin, "Novels and Systems," *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 34, no. 2 (2001): 202–15.

Conclusion

As the novel gained popularity and readership in the eighteenth century, it developed a close relationship with the world. Six decades before Barbauld commented on novelists' knowledge of the world and their giving their works to the world, Samuel Johnson wrote in *Rambler* no. 4: "The works of fiction, with which the present generation seems more particularly delighted, are such as exhibit life in its true state, diversified only by accidents that daily happen in the world, and influenced by passions and qualities which are really to be found in conversing with mankind" (175). The novel, in Johnson's view, represents truth and nature, perhaps in terms not so different from poetry, but his emphasis on the novel's connectedness to the world is one of the early accounts that theorized the realist novel. As Johnson maintains, the novelist's task is to combine learning with experience which "must arise from general converse, and accurate observation of the living world" (175). In conjunction with the real world, the publishing world, or the literary marketplace, enabled novelists to reach readers and vice versa. As one of the many actors of the literary marketplace, novelists defined their authorship by their relationships with other actors. This social dimension of authorship, Rose argues, exposes the blind spots of the paternity and real estate metaphors, for they "make it difficult to see that copyright involves more than the relationship between an author and a work. They disguise the fact that it is generally publishers or other corporate entities who are the proprietors of copyrights, and they also disguise the fact that the public at large has a vital interest in copyright" ("Copyright" 15). Though Rose is discussing the metaphors of copyright in both eighteenth-century and contemporary contexts, as he

often does in "Copyright and Its Metaphors," his observation does underscore that for eighteenth-century authors, their authorial identities were increasingly defined by the ownership of their works in various relationships.

Metaphors structure how we understand the world, and they are bound to have blind spots or limitations. Unlike Rose, I believe eighteenth-century authors were capable of recognizing and working around metaphors' blind spots. Part of the reason Rose does not grant the same agency to authors is, I think, because of his own blind spots: his narrow focus on the paternity and real estate metaphors keeps him from seeing them as two of many manifestations of WRITING IS BIRTHING and WRITING IS CULTIVATION metaphors. Viewed in the context of conceptual metaphor theory, Richardson's, Sterne's, Burney's, and Barbauld's metaphors reveal how they defined authorship in relation to the public.

Traditionally, the CULTIVATION metaphor focuses on the process and labor of an author's writing his or her works, which is often expressed in terms of tilling or growing. In Richardson's and Sterne's interpretations of the metaphor, the focus of authorship shifts from labor to network. The grafting metaphor imagines authors as owners of gardens, enclosed spaces that could be transgressed or stolen from. By tapping into grafting's entailment of cuckoldry, Richardson reveals his anxiety about the paternity metaphor and shows how BIRTHING and CULTIVATION metaphors could overlap. In Sterne's account, labor is downplayed as he dismisses the Lockean property theory in the picking-up metaphor. In its stead, the settlement metaphor recasts authors as parishioners that help support one another through poor relief. Richardson's grafting metaphor and Sterne's settlement metaphor both define the social aspect of authorship through the

mediation of land. As fewer and fewer people worked in agriculture in the eighteenth century, land became less of a space to be cultivated by individuals but more of a stratum on which people in the consumer society of Britain built and defined their relationships with one another.

Compared to CULTIVATION's larger entailment potential resulting from social and technological changes, the BIRTHING metaphor entails fewer and less mutable elements of childbirth due to the nature of human biology. Responding to the paternity metaphor that has been monopolized by male authors for centuries, Burney and Barbauld gingerly develop their interpretations of the maternity metaphor to advocate female authorship. Using cipher's associations with identity and positionality, Burney reinvents the paternity metaphor into one where motherhood and sisterhood are encoded into the heart of the cipher metaphor. Though less developed than Burney's, Barbauld's dissenter metaphor similarly attempts to conceptualize maternity metaphor by appropriating a source domain not encompassed by BIRTHING. Despite women authors' waxing number and popularity at the turn of the nineteenth century, Burney and Barbauld theorize female authorship in covert ways instead of fleshing out the maternity metaphor. Maybe it was because Burney was unmarried when she published *Evelina* and Barbauld never had children. Maybe it was because the paternity metaphor was still too dominant and female authorship was still too stigmatized. Whatever the reason, the maternity metaphor is in gestation, waiting to be born into the world.

In 1818, Mary Shelley published *Frankenstein; or, the Modern Prometheus*, and her treatment of authorship parallels Burney's *Evelina* in many respects. Both women published anonymously and dedicated their works to their fathers. Both novels are

initially placed in the male canon in their first-edition prefaces, only to be revised in paratexts of later editions. *Frankenstein*'s 1818 Preface, penned by Percy Bysshe Shelley, puts the novel in the tradition of "the highest specimens of poetry" stretching from Homer, Shakespeare, to Milton (5). In her 1831 Introduction, Mary Shelley moves away from the male canon and uses the maternity metaphor to describe her authorship: "I bid my hideous progeny go forth and prosper" (169). Shelley's progeny tells the story of Victor Frankenstein's creation the monster assembled from human corpses. When Shelley began writing *Frankenstein* in 1816, she had experienced many births and deaths relating to motherhood, from her own mother, Mary Wollstonecraft's death at giving birthing to her, to the births and deaths of her first two children. Consequently, many scholars have read *Frankenstein* as a metaphor for motherhood and female authorship. Ellen Moers argues that "*Frankenstein* seems to be distinctly a woman's mythmaking on the subject of birth precisely because its emphasis is not upon what precedes birth, not upon birth itself, but upon what follows birth: the trauma of the afterbirth" (321). Victor's repulsion by the monster can thus be read as a case of postpartum depression. Following Moers's reading of motherhood into the novel, Barbara Johnson suggests that *Frankenstein* "can be read as the story of the experience of writing *Frankenstein*. What is at stake in Mary's introduction as well as in the novel is the description of a *primal scene of creation*" (7). The intertwining of motherhood and female authorship demonstrates Shelley's wrestling with the BIRTHING metaphor, particularly with paternity (i.e. Frankenstein and the monster), and her declaration of the maternity metaphor. Not only does *Frankenstein* show how the BIRTHING metaphor provides Shelley with the framework for thinking about authorship, but it could also be emblematic of the

methodology and potential of applying conceptual metaphor theory to the study of authorship. Just like Shelley assembles her work from her experience and reading, we can assemble authorial metaphors from the scattered metaphorical linguistic expressions authors leave in their writings. The assembled metaphors may not be as polished, they may even be, as Shelley describes, hideous, but locating the seams at which various domains and entailments are sewn together will give us insight into how authors process and conceptualize their authorship in the making. In the absence of full-fledged commentaries by authors on their own authorships, conceptual metaphor theory provides an environment where we can hypothesize and test authorial metaphors.

Bibliography

Anderson, Howard. "Associationism and Wit in *Tristram Shandy*." *Philological Quarterly*, vol. 48, no. 1, 1969, pp. 27–41.

Anon. *The Crafte of Graffynge & Plantynge of Trees*. London, 1518.

Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. Oxford UP, 1987.

Astell, Mary. *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies. Parts I and II*. 1697. Edited by Patricia Springborg, Pickering & Chatto, 1997.

Bailey, Nathan. "Cuckold." *Dictionarium Britannicum: Or a More Compleat Universal Etymological English Dictionary Than Any Extant*, London, 1730.

Barbauld, Anna Letitia. "Life of Samuel Richardson, with Remarks on His Writings." *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, edited by Anna Letitia Barbauld. London, 1804, pp. vii–ccxii.

---. "[Memoir of Hester Mulso Chapone]." *Monthly Magazine*, vol. 13, 1802, pp. 39–40.

---. "Memoir of the Rev. R. Barbauld." *Monthly Repository*, vol. 3, 1808, pp. 706–9.

---. *Selected Poetry and Prose*. Broadview, 2002.

---. *The British Novelists; with an Essay, and Prefaces Biographical and Critical*. London, 1810.

---. *The Works of Anna Laetitia Barbauld*. Edited by Lucy Aikin, London, 1825.

Barker-Benfield, G. J. *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. U of Chicago P, 1992.

Battles, Kelly E. “Anna Barbauld’s Authorial Self-Fashioning: From “Fair Pedagogue” to “Fatidical Spinster”.” *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2015, pp. 143–62.

Beebee, Thomas O. “Deciphering the Word ‘Cypher’ in Samuel Richardson’s *Clarissa*.” *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes and Reviews*, vol. 1, no. 2, 1988, pp. 50–53.

Beer, Gillian. “*Pamela*: Rethinking *Arcadia*.” *Samuel Richardson: Tercentenary Essays*, edited by Margaret Anne Doody and Peter Sabor, Cambridge UP, 1989, pp. 23–39.

Bell, Susan Groag. “Women Create Gardens in Male Landscapes: A Revisionist Approach to Eighteenth-Century English Garden History.” *Feminist Studies*, vol. 16, no. 3, 1990, pp. 471–91.

Benedict, Barbara M. *Making the Modern Reader: Cultural Mediation in Early Modern Literary Anthologies*. Princeton UP, 1996.

---. “The Paradox of the Anthology: Collecting and Difference in Eighteenth-Century Britain.” *New Literary History*, vol. 34, no. 2, 2003, pp. 231–56.

Bennett, Andrew. *The Author*. Routledge, 2005.

Bloom, Lillian D., and Edward A. Bloom. “Fanny Burney’s Novels: The Retreat from Wonder.” *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 12, no. 3, 1979, pp. 215–35.

Blumenberg, Hans. *Paradigms for a Metaphorology*. Translated by Robert Savage, Cornell UP, 2010.

Brewer, David A. *The Afterlife of Character, 1726-1825*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2005.

Burke, Edmund. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful*. Edited by Adam Phillips, Oxford UP, 2008.

Burke, Seán. *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault, and Derrida*. Edinburgh UP, 2010.

Burney, Frances. *Camilla; or, A Picture of Youth*. Edited by Edward A. Bloom and Lillian D. Bloom, Oxford UP, 1972.

---. *Cecilia, or Memoirs of an Heiress*. Edited by Peter Sabor and Margaret Anne Doody, Oxford UP, 2009.

---. *The Complete Plays of Frances Burney*. Edited by Peter Sabor and Geoffrey M. Sill, vol. 1, McGill-Queen's UP, 1995.

---. "Dedication." *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties*, edited by Margaret Anne Doody et al., Oxford UP, 1991, pp. 3–10.

---. *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame D'Arblay).* Edited by Joyce Hemlow, vol. 6, Clarendon, 1972.

---. *The Early Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney*. Edited by Lars E. Troide et al., McGill-Queen's UP, 1988–2012. 5 vols.

---. *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties*. Edited by Margaret Anne Doody et al., Oxford UP, 1991.

Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. Edited by Thomas C. Faulkner et al., vol. 1, Clarendon, 1989.

Bushnell, Rebecca W. *Green Desire: Imagining Early Modern English Gardens*. Cornell UP, 2003.

Castle, Terry. *Clarissa's Ciphers: Meaning and Disruption in Richardson's* Clarissa. Cornell UP, 1982.

---. *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnivalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction*. Stanford UP, 1986.

---. "Women and Literary Criticism." *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: The Eighteenth Century*, edited by Claude Rawson and H. B. Nisbet, vol. 4, Cambridge UP, 1997, pp. 434–55.

Cavendish, Margaret. "Sociable Letters." *By a Woman Writt: Literature from Six Centuries by and About Women*, edited by Joan Susan Goulianos, Bobbs-Merrill, 1973, p. 65.

Cecil, Evelyn. *A History of Gardening in England.* Singing Tree, 1969.

Chambers, Ephraim. *Cyclopaedia, or, an Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences.* 7th ed., London, 1751.

Chartier, Roger. *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe Between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. Translated by Lydia G. Cochrane, Stanford UP, 1994.

Choi, Samuel. "Signing Evelina: Female Self-Inscription in the Discourse of Letters." *Studies in the Novel*, vol. 31, no. 3, 1999, pp. 259–78.

The Complete Letter-Writer. London, 1776.

Critical Review. Vol. 46, 1778.

Curran, Louise. *Samuel Richardson and the Art of Letter-Writing*. Cambridge UP, 2016.

Curtis, Lewis Perry, editor. *Letters of Laurence Sterne*. Clarendon, 1935.

de Cervantes, Miguel. *The Adventures of Don Quixote de La Mancha*. Edited by Carlos Fuentes, Translated by Tobias Smollett, Andre Deutsch, 1986.

Derrida, Jacques. *Dissemination*. Translated by Barbara Johnson, U of Chicago P, 1981.

---. *Limited Inc*. Northwestern University Press, 1988.

---. "White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy." *New Literary History*, translated by F. C. T. Moore, vol. 6, no. 1, 1974, pp. 5–74.

Ding, Katherine. "The Legible Face and the Illegible Body: Face-Work in Lichtenberg, Haywood, and Garrick." *ELH*, vol. 85, no. 3, 2018, pp. 715–46.

Doody, Margaret Anne. *A Natural Passion: A Study of the Novels of Samuel Richardson*. Oxford UP, 1974.

---. *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works*. Rutgers UP, 1988.

Eaves, T. C. Duncan, and Ben D. Kimpel. *Samuel Richardson: A Biography*. Oxford UP, 1971.

Ellerbeck, Erin. "Adoption and the Language of Horticulture in *All's Well That Ends Well*." *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, vol. 51, no. 2, 2011, pp. 305–26.

Epstein, Julia. *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing*. U of Wisconsin P, 1989.

Ezell, Margaret J. M. "Manuscript and Print Cultures 1500–1700." *The Cambridge Handbook of Literary Authorship*, edited by Ingo Berensmeyer et al., Cambridge UP, 2019, pp. 115–32.

---. *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1999.

Feerick, Jean E. “The Imperial Graft: Horticulture, Hybridity, and the Art of Mingling Races in *Henry V* and *Cymbeline*.” *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Embodiment: Gender, Sexuality, and Race*, edited by Valerie Traub, Oxford UP, 2016, pp. 211–27.

Ferriar, John. *Illustrations of Sterne; with Other Essays and Verses.* Garland, 1971.

Fielding, Henry. *Tom Jones*. Edited by John Bender and Simon Stern, Oxford UP, 2008.

Foucault, Michel. “What Is an Author?” *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, edited by Donald F. Bouchard, translated by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Cornell UP, 1977, pp. 113–38.

Gallagher, Catherine. *Nobody’s Story: The Vanishing Acts of Women Writers in the Marketplace, 1670-1820*. U of California P, 1995.

Gamer, Michael. “A Select Collection: Barbauld, Scott, and the Rise of the (Reprinted) Novel.” *Recognizing the Romantic Novel: New Histories of British Fiction, 1780–1830*, edited by Jillian Heydt-Stevenson and Charlotte Sussman, Liverpool UP, 2010, pp. 155–91.

Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge UP, 1997.

Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. Yale UP, 1979.

Gow, James S. “A Brief Account of Sterne’s Homiletic Piracy.” *Divine Rhetoric: Essays on the Sermons of Laurence Sterne*, edited by William Blake Gerard, vol. 1, U of Delaware P, 2010, pp. 123–48.

Greenfield, Susan C. “Monkeying Around in *Evelina*: Identity and Resemblance Again.” *Eighteenth-Century Novel*, vols. 6-7, 2009, pp. 409–28.

---. "'Oh Dear Resemblance of Thy Murdered Mother': Female Authorship in *Evelina*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 3, no. 4, 1991, pp. 301–20.

Griffin, Dustin H. *Authorship in the Long Eighteenth Century*. U of Delaware P, 2014.

Guillory, John. *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation*. U of Chicago P, 1993.

Hammond, Lansing Van Der Heyden. *Laurence Sterne's Sermons of Mr. Yorick.* Yale UP, 1948.

Havens, Hilary. *Revising the Eighteenth-Century Novel: Authorship from Manuscript to Print*. Cambridge UP, 2019.

Hawley, Judith. "Tristram Shandy, Learned Wit, and Enlightenment Knowledge." *The Cambridge Companion to Laurence Sterne*, edited by Thomas Keymer, Cambridge UP, 2009, pp. 34–48.

Haywood, Eliza. *The Female Spectator.* 7th ed., London, 1771.

Holm, Melanie D. "Laughter, Skepticism, and the Pleasures of Being Misunderstood in Laurence Sterne's *the Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*." *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 55, no. 4, 2014, pp. 355–75.

Horace. *Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*. Translated by H. Rushton Fairclough, Harvard UP, 1978.

Jackson, H. J. "Sterne, Burton, and Ferriar: Allusions to the *Anatomy of Melancholy* in Volumes V to IV of *Tristram Shandy*." *Philological Quarterly*, vol. 54, no. 2, 1975, pp. 457–70.

Johnson, Barbara. "My Monster/My Self." *Diacritics*, vol. 12, no. 2, 1982, pp. 2–10.

Johnson, Claudia L. "'Let Me Make the Novels of a Country': Barbauld's *The British Novelists* (1810/1820)." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 34, no. 2, 2001, pp. 163–79.

Johnson, Mark. "Philosophy's Debt to Metaphor." *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Raymond W. Gibbs, Cambridge UP, 2008, pp. 39–52.

Johnson, Samuel. *A Dictionary of the English Language.* 2nd ed., vol. 1, London, 1755.

---. *Samuel Johnson: The Major Works*. Edited by Donald J Greene, Oxford UP, 2008.

---. *The Idler and The Adventurer*. Edited by W. J. Bate et al., Yale UP, 1963.

---. *The Rambler*. Edited by W. J. Bate and Albrecht B. Strauss, Yale UP, 1969.

Jones, Darrell. "Locke and Sterne: The History of a Critical Hobby-Horse." *Shandean: An Annual Devoted to Laurence Sterne and His Works*, vol. 27, 2016, pp. 83–111.

Keenleyside, Heather. "The First-Person Form of Life: Locke, Sterne, and the Autobiographical Animal." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2012, pp. 116–41.

Keymer, Thomas. *Sterne, the Moderns, and the Novel*. Oxford UP, 2002.

Keymer, Thomas, and Peter Sabor. Pamela *in the Marketplace: Literary Controversy and Print Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland*. Cambridge UP, 2005.

King, Amy. *Bloom: The Botanical Vernacular in the English Novel*. Oxford UP, 2003.

Kövecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. 2nd ed., Oxford UP, 2010.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. 1980. U of Chicago P, 2008.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Turner. *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. U of Chicago P, 1989.

Lamb, Jonathan. *Sterne's Fiction and the Double Principle*. Cambridge UP, 1989.

---. “Sterne’s System of Imitation.” *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 76, no. 4, 1981, pp. 794–810.

Le Breton, Anna Letitia. *Memoir of Mrs. Barbauld, Including Letters and Notices of Her Family and Friends*. AMS, 1974.

Leed, Jacob. “Richardson’s Pamela and Sidney’s.” *Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association*, vol. 40, no. 1, 1973, pp. 240–45.

Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Edited by Peter H. Nidditch, Clarendon, 1975.

---. *Second Treatise of Government*. Edited by C. B. Macpherson, Hackett, 1980.

Machacek, Gregory. “Allusion.” *PMLA*, vol. 122, no. 2, 2007, pp. 522–36.

MacKenzie, Scott. “‘Stock the Parish with Beauties’: Henry Fielding’s Parochial Vision.” *PMLA*, vol. 125, no. 3, 2010, pp. 606–21.

Marana, Giovanni Paolo. *Letters Writ by a Turkish Spy.* London, 1770.

McCarthy, William. *Anna Letitia Barbauld: Voice of the Enlightenment*. Johns Hopkins UP, 2008.

---. “Why Anna Letitia Barbauld Refused to Head a Women’s College: New Facts, New Story.” *Nineteenth-Century Contexts*, vol. 23, no. 3, 2001, pp. 349–79.

McDonald, Daniel, editor. *Selected Essays from* The Tatler, The Spectator, *and* The Guardian. Bobbs-Merrill, 1973.

McKeon, Michael. *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private, and the Division of Knowledge*. Johns Hopkins UP, 2009.

Mee, Jon. *Romanticism, Enthusiasm, and Regulation: Poetics and the Policing of Culture in the Romantic Period*. Oxford UP 2003.

Meyer, Leonard B. *Music, the Arts, and Ideas: Patterns and Predictions in Twentieth-Century Culture*. U of Chicago P, 1994.

Miller, Philip. "CORONA SOLIS; The Sun-Flower." *The Gardeners Dictionary*, 2nd ed., London, 1733.

Moers, Ellen. "Female Gothic: The Monster's Mother." *Frankenstein: The 1818 Text, Context, Criticism*, edited by J. Paul Hunter, 2nd ed., Norton, 2012, pp. 317–27.

Monthly Magazine. 1796.

Monthly Review. Vol. 58, 1778.

Moore, Catherine E. "'Ladies . . . Taking the Pen in Hand': Mrs. Barbauld's Criticism of Eighteenth-Century Women Novelists." *Fetter'd or Free? British Women Novelists, 1670–1815*, edited by Mary Anne Schofield and Cecilia Macheski, Ohio UP, 1986, pp. 383–97.

Mossoff, Adam. "Saving Locke from Marx: The Labor Theory of Value in Intellectual Property Theory." *Social Philosophy and Policy*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2012, pp. 283–317.

Nardizzi, Vin. "Shakespeare's Penknife: Grafting and Seedless Generation in the Procreation Sonnets." *Renaissance and Reformation.*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2009, pp. 83–106.

New, Melvyn. "Introduction." *Tristram Shandy: The Notes*, edited by Melvyn New et al., vol. 3, UP of Florida, 1984, pp. 1–31.

---, “Introduction.” *The Sermons of Laurence Sterne: The Notes*. edited by Melvyn New, UP of Florida, 1996.

Orr, Leah. *Novel Ventures: Fiction and Print Culture in England, 1690–1730*. U of Virginia P, 2017.

Pasco, Allan H. *Allusion: A Literary Graft*. U of Toronto P, 1994.

Pawl, Amy J. “‘And What Other Name May I Claim?’ Names and Their Owners in Frances Burney’s *Evelina*.” *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 3, no. 4, 1991, pp. 283–300.

Pope, Alexander. *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*. Edited by George Sherburn, Clarendon, 1956.

Price, Leah. *The Anthology and the Rise of the Novel: From Richardson to George Eliot*. Cambridge UP, 2000.

Quarles, Francis. *Argalus and Parthenia*. Folger Shakespeare Library, 1986.

---. *The Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Francis Quarles*. Vol. 2, AMS, 1967.

Rabinowitz, Peter J. “‘What’s Hecuba to Us?’ The Audience’s Experience of Literary Borrowing.” *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, edited by Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman, Princeton UP, 1980, pp. 241–63.

Raven, James. “Historical Introduction: The Novel Comes of Age.” *The English Novel 1770–1829: A Bibliographical Survey of Prose Fiction Published in the British Isles*, edited by James Raven and Antonia Forster, vol. 1, Oxford UP, 2000, pp. 15–121.

---. “The Book Trades.” *Books and Their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England: New Essays*, edited by Isabel Rivers, Continuum, 2003, pp. 1–34.

Richardson, Samuel. *Clarissa: Or the History of a Young Lady*. Edited by Angus Ross, Penguin, 1986.

---. *Pamela in Her Exalted Condition*. Edited by Albert J. Rivero, Cambridge UP, 2012.

---. *Pamela: Or, Virtue Rewarded*. Edited by Peter Sabor, Penguin, 2003.

---. *Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson*. Edited by John Carroll, Clarendon, 1964.

---. *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*. Edited by Anna Letitia Barbauld, London, 1804.

Ricœur, Paul. *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-Disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language*. U of Toronto P, 1977.

Rose, Mark. *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright*. Harvard UP, 1993.

---. "Copyright and Its Metaphors." *UCLA Law Review*, vol. 50, 2002, pp. 1–16.

---. "The Author as Proprietor: *Donaldson V. Becket* and the Genealogy of Modern Authorship." *Representations*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1988, pp. 51–85.

Ross, Ian Campbell. *Laurence Sterne: A Life*. Oxford UP, 2001.

Schellenberg, Betty A. *Literary Coteries and the Making of Modern Print Culture: 1740–1790*. Cambridge UP, 2016.

---. "From Propensity to Profession: Female Authorship and the Early Career of Frances Burney." *Eighteenth Century Fiction*, vol. 14, no. 3/4, 2002, pp. 345–70.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. "The Character in the Veil: Imagery of the Surface in the Gothic Novel." *PMLA*, vol. 96, no. 2, 1981, pp. 255–70.

Semino, Elena, and Gerard Steen. "Metaphor in Literature." *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Raymond W. Gibbs, Cambridge UP, 2008, pp. 232–46.

"Settlement." *OED*.

Shakespeare, William. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Edited by G. Blakemore Evans and J. J. M. Tobin, 2nd ed., Houghton Mifflin, 1996.

Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein: The 1818 Text, Context, Criticism*. Edited by J. Paul Hunter, 2nd ed., Norton, 2012.

Silver, Sean. *The Mind Is a Collection: Case Studies in Eighteenth-Century Thought*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2015.

Simonova, Natasha. *Early Modern Authorship and Prose Continuations: Adaptation and Ownership from Sidney to Richardson*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Siskin, Clifford. "Novels and Systems." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 34, no. 2, 2001, pp. 202–15.

---. *The Work of Writing: Literature and Social Change in Britain, 1700–1830*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1999.

Slack, Paul. *The English Poor Law, 1531-1782*. Cambridge UP, 1990.

Spacks, Patricia Meyer. *Imagining a Self: Autobiography and Novel in Eighteenth-Century England*. Harvard UP, 1976.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene*. Edited by A. C. Hamilton et al., 2nd ed., Longman, 2007.

St. Clair, William. *The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period*. Cambridge UP, 2004.

Sterne, Laurence. *The Florida Edition of the Works of Laurence Sterne*. Edited by Melvyn New et al., UP of Florida, 1978–2014. 9 vols.

---. *A Sentimental Journey and Other Writings*. Edited by Tim Parnell and Ian Jack, Oxford UP, 2008.

---. *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*. Edited by James A. Work, Odyssey, 1940.

Straub, Kristina. *Divided Fictions: Fanny Burney and Feminine Strategy*. UP of Kentucky, 1987.

Suarez, S.J., Michael F. "Business of Fiction: Novel Publishing, 1695–1774." *The Oxford Handbook of the Eighteenth-Century Novel*, edited by J. A. Downie, Oxford UP, 2016, pp. 22–38.

Switzer, Stephen. *Ichnographia Rustica: Or, the Nobleman, Gentleman, and Gardener's Recreation.* Vol. 2, London, 1718.

Taylor, Richard C. "James Harrison, *the Novelist's Magazine*, and the Early Canonizing of the English Novel." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 33, no. 3, 1993, pp. 629–43.

Thacker, Christopher. *The History of Gardens*. U of California P, 1979.

Traugott, John. *Tristram Shandy's World: Sterne's Philosophical Rhetoric.* U of California P, 1954.

Tucker, Susie I. *Enthusiasm: A Study in Semantic Change*. Cambridge UP, 1972.

Vareschi, Mark. *Everywhere and Nowhere: Anonymity and Mediation in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. U of Minnesota P, 2018.

---. "Motive, Intention, Anonymity, and *Evelina*." *ELH*, vol. 82, no. 4, 2015, pp. 1135–58.

Volk-Birke, Sabine. "Assuming Authority: Barbauld as Critic." *Anna Letitia Barbauld: New Perspectives*, edited by William McCarthy and Olivia Murphy, Bucknell UP, 2014, pp. 217–36.

Wagner, Jennifer A. “Privacy and Anonymity in *Evelina*.” *Fanny Burney’s Evelina*, edited by Harold Bloom, Chelsea, 1988, pp. 99–109.

Wehrs, Donald R. “Sterne, Cervantes, Montaigne: Fideistic Skepticism and the Rhetoric of Desire.” *Comparative Literature Studies*, vol. 25, no. 2, 1988, pp. 127–51.

White, Daniel E. *Early Romanticism and Religious Dissent*. Cambridge UP, 2006.

Wilson, Miranda. “Bastard Grafts, Crafted Fruits: Shakespeare’s Planted Families.” *The Indistinct Human in Renaissance Literature*, edited by Jean E. Feerick and Vin Nardizzi, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, pp. 101–17.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman and A Vindication of the Rights of Men*. Edited by Janet Todd, Oxford UP, 2009.

Woodmansee, Martha. “The Genius and the Copyright: Economic and Legal Conditions of the Emergence of the ‘Author’.” *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 17, no. 4, 1984, pp. 425–48.